

*G. A. Sanders*

THE

# LUTHERAN QUARTERLY.

EDITED BY

**PHILIP M. BIKLE,**

WITH THE SPECIAL CO-OPERATION OF

M. VALENTINE, D. D., LL. D.,  
E. J. WOLF, D. D.,

S. A. ORT, D. D., LL. D.,  
W. H. WYNN, PH. D., D. D.

NEW SERIES—VOL. XXIV.



GETTYSBURG:

J. E. WIBLE, STEAM PRINTER, CARLISLE STREET, (SECOND SQUARE).

1894.

to extreme old age. Anthony, born in 251, became a hermit in the Egyptian deserts, and during his life-time the deserts of Egypt were peopled with anchorites. Dr. Schaff says, "A mania for monasticism possessed Christendom and seized the people of all classes like an epidemic. Nothing was more common than to see from two to five hundred monks under the same abbot. It has been supposed that in Egypt the number of anchorites and cenobites equaled the population of Egypt." Another epidemic was the crusades, started by the feeble but fanatical Peter. The most powerful sovereigns were swept on by the current, and against personal convictions and interests were forced to take up the cross. The mania lasted for two centuries, costing Europe immense sums of money and innumerable lives. One of the most remarkable facts connected with this great movement was that of the children, in 1213. The preacher was Stephen, a French peasant lad about twelve years old. The children became wild and flocked in great crowds to the places of rendezvous. Bolts and bars could not restrain them. The majority were under twelve years of age. The world was puzzled, some believing that it was incited by the Holy Spirit and others that it was from Satan. It had its cause in the general epidemic. Another epidemic was the flagellant mania of the thirteenth century which broke out in Italy and spread into France, Flanders and Germany, and extended the next century into England. Large bodies of men marched through the cities, scourging themselves and at the same time singing and praying and calling upon the people to repent. The authorities both ecclesiastical and civil found it necessary to take steps to suppress it. Though severely persecuted it did not fully disappear until late in the eighteenth century. Another epidemic was the dancing madness, in the fourteenth century in Germany. Men and women appeared to lose all control of their senses and danced hand in hand until they fell from exhaustion. While dancing they were haunted by spirits whose names they shrieked out. Peasants, mechanics, housewives left their duties to join the wild revels. Similar to the two last was the jumping mania which also began in Germany in 1813, and lasted half a cen-

tury. It commanded the attention of scholars. Another epidemic was that for preaching which appeared in Sweden in 1842. Uneducated men, women and children, after convulsions, broke out into deeply moving sermons on repentance and the speedily approaching judgment of God. Another epidemic was that of the singing children which commenced in Silesia in 1717. It was one of the extravagancies connected with the Pietistic movement in Germany. Little ones, some as young as four years old, gathered into the open fields to sing and pray. It spread all over the country. The pulpit denounced it and the civil authorities tried to arrest it, but scourgings and confinements only inflamed the zeal of the children. But when churches were provided for them the mania soon subsided. In every one of these epidemics there were general antecedent conditions. There were general ideas and events which needed only to be clearly stated to awaken into great power. Very often a slight cause was sufficient to arouse a movement which spread by sympathy until it involved a continent. The more mystical excited the greater fanaticism.

Modern spiritualism is like these and other mental epidemics in its humble beginning, its rapid spread, its distinguished converts, the general attention received and its seeming supernatural phenomena. Like them, its agents are often children as well as men and women. As of them, so it is asked of it, is it of God, or of Satan?

It sprang out of known conditions. One of them was general religious opinion. A great rationalistic wave swept over Germany, France, England and America in the earlier part of this century. The authority of the Bible was weakened in the public mind. Its teachings were not taken as final and decisive, and men looked more and more to their own reason. There had been also those great strides in the physical sciences which soon developed the strong materialistic tendency that characterizes one half of the century. The pulpit, that had so long been engaged very largely in controversial discussions, began in the first quarter of the century to treat more and more exclusively questions of morality and of practical life. The public mind

was losing its convictions of personal immortality, and the bereaved no longer found in their religious beliefs true comfort in their sorrows. Religion was becoming to a great degree a matter of mere assent that had little power over the heart in the trials of life. There was a deep feeling of unrest and of a great unsatisfied want. Men cannot live without religious convictions, and those who become skeptical in regard to the Bible become credulous in other matters. Religious doubts made the age susceptible to impositions. Men cannot believe that this life is all of existence, and when the old grounds of faith in immortality were weakening they felt anxiously around for some other supports. Spiritualism proposed to give them certainty of a future life. It offered a direct and positive proof of a life beyond the grave. It claimed to give a perfect refutation of a materialistic skepticism. It professed to lift the veil which hangs between this world and that which is on the other side of death. It seemed by its phenomena to make good its claims, and thus brought comfort to many who were earnestly inquiring, "If a man die shall he live again?" It seemed to bring the clearest evidence that the soul not only continued to exist but retained a conscious love and acquaintance with the interest of those who were left on earth. It satisfied many of the bereaved by seeming to give them tests of the senses. It aroused, therefore, the slumbering religious feelings. It subverted skepticism arising from materialism. The early advocates said, "Millions in our country have become convinced of the immortality of the soul who had been skeptical before the interposition of spiritualism." They gave a great many instances of conversion from infidelity. Dr. Hare had been an atheist. He became converted through spiritualism that his sister who had died still lived in another state, and he reasoned according to his own statement in this way: If she lives I shall live also, and there is immortality; if immortality, there is a God. But I do not stop there. I believe in a revelation and in a revelation through Jesus Christ. I am a Christian." The plea constantly made for it was that it rescued men from infidelity. The conditions were favorable for spiritualism, and in them we have a suffi-

cient reason for the rapidity of its growth and the enthusiasm it aroused. There was a fine opportunity for impostors, and even spiritualists admit that they were numerous. Wherever the same conditions exist we find spiritualism strongest.

The likeness to general delusions is against it, but we cannot rest our final judgment upon that fact. It is like the Reformation of the sixteenth century, the Methodist movement in the eighteenth, and indeed every great revolution. All of these were in a good sense epidemics. We must examine the evidence upon which it proposes to base its claims.

Modern spiritualism in its fundamental idea is not new. Spiritualists claim a historic relationship with a number of things in the past. William Howitt, in his History of the Supernatural, from a wide range of reading has found traces of spiritualism among the ancients and in various countries in modern times. He claims too much, but he has shown clearly that spiritualism is not only very old but has been very widely believed. These old ideas furnished another favorable condition.

The Jews believed in the possibility of communicating with the spirits of the dead through mediums. There were divine laws against spiritualistic practices. Saul violated his own decree as well as the law of God when he went to consult the Witch of Endor, a noted medium in that day. Spiritualists claim a kinship with the ancient heathen oracles. The deities were supposed to give responses through mediums. The resemblance between the answers of the oracles and those of spiritualism is often very striking. The oracles were frauds, and the likeness is not very creditable to spiritualism.

There are traces of spiritualistic practices among the Romans about the beginning of the Christian era. Virgil describes a magician :

"Her charms can call what soul she please,  
Rob other hearts of healthful ease,  
Turn rivers backward to their source,  
And make the stars forget their course."

Tertullian speaks of circles formed of joined hands which could call up the spirits of the dead and make tables prophesy.

During the last two centuries there were numerous instances of mysterious knockings. Some of them elicited a deep interest. The Cocklane Ghost was investigated by Dr. Johnson and Bishop Percy. The medium was a little girl. No trick was discovered. The Drummer of Tedworth, about the same time, was equally celebrated. There were lights, knockings, moving of furniture, answering of raps, and other phenomena for which no cause was discovered. There were also the mysteries of the Wesley family of which there are accounts in the letters to John and Charles while they were at the university. Mr. Wesley, a clergyman of the Church of England, at first scolded his wife for giving credence to the reports of the children and servants, but he himself became a witness and wrote a full description of the mysterious sounds, closing of doors and shaking of furniture. On one occasion he rebuked the spirit for frightening children, and got as a response violent raps. On another he said, "If thou art my son Samuel knock three times but no more," but the noise ceased for the night. A large mastiff dog was greatly agitated during the disturbances and frequently manifested excitement before the noises began. The account of these things obtained wide currency through John Wesley and helped to prepare the way for the spread of the later spiritualism.

Dr. Kerner gave notoriety to the seeress of Provorst, Fredonia Hauffer, who for seven years previous to her death was in a magnetic state. She was thought to describe the persons and to report the words of spirits, and her visions were often accompanied by mysterious rappings. Two noted Frenchmen reported marvels of their own experience. Bellot said that he had seen and felt the spirits. Deleuze acknowledged that he was fully convinced that spiritual objects had been made visible.

In the earlier part of our century supposed instances of communication with the invisible world were occurring in Europe and America. The Shakers in New York were, in 1843, the subjects of strange experiences. Some of them fell into trances and professed to be the organs of the dead.

Mesmerism also helped to prepare the way for the new form

of spiritualism. Mesmer supposed that he had discovered a new force in nature, and believed that he had brought even the sun under his influence. About 1815 Puysegur used mesmerism in treating diseases. A little later it was employed in surgery. It was at the time a great mystery, and it is not strange that it was thought by many to open a means of communication with the spirit world. Great marvels were reported. A boy fifteen years old was said to speak Latin more fluently than his vernacular. A person who had never learned English was said to speak it as if it were his mother tongue. A woman who was ignorant of Eschenmeyer's mystical philosophy was said to have discussed it with great familiarity. But the facts were often exaggerated. Dr. Carpenter gives an instance. The servant of Miss H. Martineau was reported as able to converse in languages of which she was entirely ignorant, but when tested by Dr. Noble was found to only imitate them in an unmeaning articulation of sound. Mesmerism is for us no mystery. It is nothing more than an artificial somnambulism in which the subject is exposed in a helpless way to suggestions and is made to think and act at the will of another.

All these things contributed to the preparation of the public mind for modern spiritualism.

It began in Hydeville, a very small village in Wayne county, New York, in the Fox family who occupied temporarily a house supposed to be haunted. Mr. J. D. Fox was a respectable farmer. Mrs. Fox's grandmother had the power of second sight and in that way saw frequently funerals at considerable distances from her. A sister of Mrs. Fox had a similar power. The Fox family were thus familiar with such ideas. From the time the family moved to Hydeville they were disturbed by noises of an occult nature. Sometimes they were distinct knockings, hammerings like those of a shoe-maker, and footsteps. Chairs and tables were moved from their places. These things continued for several months. One night Kate, a child of nine years, observed that the knockings corresponded with the rattles

made by her father on the sash. She snapped her finger and

said, "Here, old Spit-foot, do as I do." There was a response. She exclaimed, "Only look, mother," and repeated the snapping of her finger with similar results. The mother said, "Count ten," and there were ten raps. "How old is my daughter Margaret?" and there were twelve raps. "How old is Kate?" and there were nine. Other questions were asked and answered correctly. Through these raps they discovered subsequently the body of a man buried in the cellar. It was identified as that of one Rosmer, who had suddenly disappeared and had probably been murdered. Such is the account given some years afterwards, but as no notes were taken at the time there may have been a good many additions unintentionally made to the facts. No memory of it, since so much had grown out of it, could be strictly reliable after the lapse of several years. Spiritualists wonder at the results of the experiment of that night. There had been previously a number of similar experiments. The Tedworth drummer had answered questions by knocks in the presence of Sir Thomas Chamberlain. At the house of Sir William York, in 1769, sounds were imitated by the ghost. In the Wesley family there were raps at the Amen at prayers. One of Mr. Wesley's daughters knocked and was answered. The Hydeville raps would have ended with the wonder of the village if Kate and her sister had not gone to Rochester to visit Mrs. Fisk, a married sister. Public exhibitions were given in Rochester and a deep interest excited. Accounts were published in the papers of the city and the report was spread over the State. The sisters went to New York City where the phenomena were the subject of earnest discussion in every circle. A committee of the most eminent physicians was appointed to make a thorough examination of the facts. The Congregational Association appointed a similar committee. Very soon there were spiritualistic circles all over the country.

Mrs. Hayden first carried the new manifestations to England in 1852. Three years later D. D. Horne went over and had sittings with Alexander II., of Russia, and Napoleon III., both of whom made him rich presents. Mr. Squire and Miss Florence Cook went several years afterwards. Dr. Henry Slade also

went and drew to his seances a large number of distinguished persons among whom were W. M. Thackery, Robert Chambers and Mr. Crooks, Editor of the *Quarterly Journal of Science*. He also crossed to Germany and his performances were investigated by very distinguished scholars in the universities.

There are facts in spiritualism that cannot be fully explained, but some of the greatest mysteries as it first appeared have been entirely removed, and there are good reasons for believing that all the others will be solved by natural causes. Perfectly truthful persons are not always competent observers. Many of the facts which have been reported were found on examination to be false. We should not attempt to explain facts before they have been clearly established. We need authenticated facts as well as satisfactory theories.

The raps exhibited by the Fox girls can be reproduced by the tendons of the lower extremities. Prof. Austin Flint discovered the possibility and Prof. Schiff of Paris succeeded in duplicating them. There is a letter from Mrs. Culver, a relative of the Fox family, in which she claims to have been taught how to produce them by one of the Fox girls. "The raps are produced by the toes. All the toes are used. After nearly a week's practice with Catherine showing me how, I could produce them perfectly myself. Elizabeth Fisk discovered the way of making them by playing with her toes while in bed. Catherine told me how to manage to answer the questions. She said it was easy enough to answer right if the one who asked the questions called the alphabet. She said the reason why she asked the people to write down several names on paper and then point to them until the spirits rapped at the right one, was to give her a chance to watch the countenances and motions of the persons, and in that way she nearly always guessed right." Spiritualists have tried to bring discredit upon this letter and claim that its unreliability has been proved. But the character of Mrs. Culver for truthfulness was vouched for by the most prominent persons of the town in which she resided. The statements she makes have confirmation in other facts. In the very beginning spiritualism was mixed up with imposture.

Mrs. Hayden was detected in using the very means described by Mrs. Culver. Mrs. Hayden surprised the people in England by the accuracy of her replies in regard to facts of which she could not possibly have had previous knowledge. But her secret was exposed by Prof. Forbes, who made her spell out "Lord Tomnoddy." Mrs. Lewis asked, "Is Mrs. Hayden an impostor?" and led her to spell out the answer "Yes."

One of the means of spirit communication is by slate-writing. Two slates are joined by hinges on one side, a slip of paper and a fragment of pencil are enclosed, and then the slates are fastened by screws. The medium who is supposed to be in entire ignorance of the questions, holds the slates in one hand under the table. The appearance of the pencil on the outside of the slates is evidence that the writing is completed. On opening the slates the answer is found. At first this appears to be positive proof of spiritual manifestation, for by no other means does it seem possible that there should be writing in slates that were firmly closed. But there are facts that need explanation. There are generally several slates within easy reach of the medium. Why do the spirits need those slates at that particular distance? He draws out frequently from under the table the slates to see if the pencil has appeared, and those sitting with him grow accustomed to repeated movements of the arms. There is always time enough for him to open the slates, read the questions, write the answers and fasten again the slate before the pencil appears on the slate. The screws are easily worked. When the slates are so tightly closed that they cannot be opened by one hand "the conditions" are not good. Why are the spirits unable or unwilling to write when the slates cannot be opened by the medium? As the writing is done within the slates, why must they always be under the table?

The Seybert Commission, acting under a sacred trust, held a number of sittings with writing mediums who had been named by prominent spiritualists as the best in the country. The Commission saw nothing at any time which might not have been done by the mediums without the help of spirits. One of the mediums visited was Mrs. Patterson. Dr. Furness sealed two

slates and left them in her charge for several months. They were returned without an answer to the enclosed question. The pencil was gone but the sides of the slates showed the signs of something like a knife having been inserted. The slates were too well closed, and the spirits could not find an entrance. Dr. C. B. Knerr had a sitting with Mrs. Patterson in broad daylight. He secretly arranged a mirror by which he might see what took place under the table. He says, "I beheld a hand closely resembling that of the medium, stealthily insert its fingers between the leaves of the slate, take out a little slip, unfold it and again fold it, grasp the little pencil which rolled to the front while the slate was tilted that way, and with rapid noiseless motion write across the slate from left to right a few lines, then the leaves of the slate were closed, the little pencil laid on the top and over all two hands were folded as in benediction." "For the third time in my little mirror I saw the stealthy fingers write on the slate." He says he was thoroughly satisfied. Some have made themselves merry over the fact that the gentlemen of the Commission went to the investigation armed with looking-glasses, but certainly honest spirits cannot find fault with little mirrors.

The Commission had several sittings with Dr. Henry Slade, and was fully convinced of fraud. Some of his tricks were considered "puerile in the simplicity of their legerdemain," but some were pronounced clever. His communications were of three sorts: those written by spirits on their own promptings, those written in answer to questions asked them on concealed slips of paper, and those by the agency of the hand of the medium. The messages were of two classes. Those without previous questions were longer and in a clear, legible hand. Those in answer to questions were miserable scrawls. This led the Commission to suspect that the longer ones had been prepared beforehand and that the slates put under the table were adroitly exchanged with others. Attention was directed to that point. The medium was caught substituting one slate for another. The opposite sides of the slates within his reach were always carefully concealed. Dr. Furness, as if by accident, knocked over

one of them leaning against the leg of an adjacent table and several members of the Commission saw that it had writing upon it. The medium was manifestly embarrassed and tried to cover it up but not to explain. The answers given to the concealed questions were tested. Prof. Thompson gave the result: "The fact appears to have been demonstrated that the medium had no difficulty in catching the purport of questions of simple construction at a glance, and that questions of more than average length, which he could not perceive the sense of, or which were somewhat misleading in their terms, were not answered intelligently." The statement is verified by examples. The Commission learned to know by his movements just when he had succeeded in reading the questions. They were fully convinced that his agitation did not come from the influence of the spirits but from the anxiety and effort to read without detection what had been written and enclosed in the slates.

The Commission had a sitting with Mr. Harry Keller, a professional juggler, who performed some independent slate-writing which was much more remarkable than any which they witnessed with the mediums. He had, like mediums, a number of slates which he seemed to wash. With the skill acquired by experience in other sittings the Commission failed to detect his methods. Writings in various languages were produced. One of the spirits was a jolly fellow and wrote, *Ich bin ein Geist und ich liebe mein Lagerbier.*" Mr. Keller afterwards revealed his tricks to a member of the Commission.

Sittings were held with Keeler through whose agency the spirits played the piano, tambourine and guitar, and rang bells. The guitar appeared above the curtain. The tambourine was whirled by means of a stick. Paper was passed over the curtain and notes were returned. An arm and fingers were shown in the sleeve of a coat. The medium and his assistants sat in front of a curtain, but behind another which came up to their necks, concealing the entire person of each except his head. The medium seemed to be grasping with both hands the arm of an assistant. There was nothing done that might not have been done if his right hand had been free, and there was no ev-

idence that it was not. Dr. Knerr saw another medium perform the same things as skillfully as Mr. Keeler. The Dr. secretly applied some printer's ink to the clothes pins which were passed back behind the curtain and were afterwards returned as the notes had been. After the seance was closed the medium's hands were stained with ink.

The Commission desired to examine spirit photography, but the photographer, whose usual price was two dollars, asked three hundred dollars for a single sitting and demanded the exclusive use of his dark rooms and his own instruments. He would not agree to an examination of those points where material agency ends and spiritual influence begins. The conditions were very properly declined.

The spirits are said to answer, without opening, sealed letters. Dr. Furness addressed the same question to five different mediums and obtained contradictory answers. Every letter to which answer was attempted showed clear marks of having been opened. Once he sent to the same medium the same question in different envelopes, the one simply sealed and the other with concealed stitches under the seals. The unstitched letter was answered and the other returned without an answer. Dr. Furness called upon Dr. J. V. Mansfield. Dr. Furness was seated at one table and wrote his inquiries. Dr. Mansfield sealed them with mucilage and went to another table and sat down behind a pile of books which concealed his hands completely from the eye of the inquirer. Dr. Furness attempted to look over the books but was severely prohibited. There was every opportunity for fraud. Dr. Furness addressed persons who never had existence outside of fiction, and their spirits just like other spirits replied to him.

There is a book with the strange title, "The Clock Struck One," written in 1855 by Rev. Samuel Watson, a distinguished Methodist minister in Tennessee and for a time the editor of prominent denominational papers. There is a chapter devoted to sittings with this same Dr. J. V. Mansfield. We are puzzled over the statements of that chapter. The spirit revealed the name of Dr. Watson to the medium. Dr. Watson's father

writes over his own name a letter. A minister gave the names of the circuits in Arkansas to which he had been appointed, and the place and date of his death. In the communications there are a large number of references to persons and incidents within the experience of Dr. Watson but could not be known to a stranger in New York. Dr. Watson certifies the correctness of everything except a few Christian names. But while we are wondering over these facts we are struck with the platitudes in the letters of such men as Bishops Soule and Andrews and Dr. Stephen Olin. These great men appear to have been dwarfed by entering into the spirit land. We do not know how the medium learned so many things, but Dr. Watson does not tell us all about the sitting and he himself may have betrayed them. Dr. Watson was writing his book in defence of himself and was easily duped. Did we know nothing of Dr. Mansfield's methods in later years this chapter would still puzzle us, but the sitting with Dr. Furness assures us that Dr. Watson was deceived. This book is a good example of a very large part of the writings of spiritualism. After more than thirty years of devotion to spiritualism, which cost him his position in the Church and many other great sacrifices, Dr. Watson has acknowledged that it was a delusion, and returned to the Methodist Church. This case illustrates how easily able men who might be thought to be competent observers may be imposed upon by persons who live by giving seances.

These facts are representative of written communications and they fully warrant us in holding in suspicion everything of the sort that comes through professional mediums.

The Seybert Commission investigated materializations. On one occasion a niece wanted to reveal herself to Dr. Furness, who had no niece in the spirit world, but when he named an imaginary one, Effie, she appeared and posed in that character, remembering certain events that the uncle knew only in romance. The visible spirits were observed to wait to be recognized. They answered frequently to scenes which exist only in fiction. When the spirits had the size and features of the mediums, wives would recognize their dead husbands, and hus-

bands their dead wives, and parents their dead daughters. The very same individual would be recognized as entirely different persons during the very same evening. There can be little doubt that all materializations are frauds.

The Seybert Commission has given spiritualism in some of its phases the most thorough investigation that has yet been made of it in America, its birth place and stronghold. Mr. Seybert, who was a firm believer in spiritualism, bequeathed sixty thousand dollars for the scientific investigation of its phenomena. The men appointed were able and honest, and accepted the appointment in good faith. All expressed a willingness and some a desire to be convinced that the dead may communicate with the living. They were patient and fair in their examinations. They submitted to all the conditions imposed by the mediums except where investigation was precluded by them. The report, given over their own signatures, is a statement of the facts observed, from which we may draw our own conclusions. The Commission is acting under high authority and the results have a trustworthiness that the work of no individual can have. Despite the derision cast upon it, their published report is exceeding valuable to the honest student of spiritualism.

The observations of the Commission have had parallels. The Society for Psychical Research published in their reports a paper by a gentleman who learned the arts of spiritualism and makes an exposé of them. He had sittings with a large number of persons who were advised to give the closest attention and to take notice of the slightest thing that looked suspicious, and requested to give him a written statement of their impressions. These statements are published in this paper, and they are quite similar to those given by persons who have attended the seances of professional mediums. Not knowing that he was not a spiritualist all were fully convinced that they had communication with the spirits. The oversights of those writing the statements are pointed out. The paper shows clearly both the incompetency of most persons in detecting jugglery and

that the phenomena of spiritualistic manifestations can be duplicated by only a fair degree of cleverness in trickery.

Spiritualists have been compelled to admit that there are impostors among mediums and that numerous impostures have been exposed. But some have attempted to excuse a certain degree of trickery as necessary to indicate to the spirits the means through which they may operate.\* Poor spirits, reduced to the use of such means. So much of the phenomena has been produced by natural means, and the conditions always are so favorable to the use of natural agents that there is little room for believing in the agency of spirits in any part of the manifestations by professionals. But there are manifestations, not connected with professional mediums, which need further examination. One of the most common of these is table rapping. There are few communities where it has not at some time been tried. It is often merely a means of amusement, but there are a great many who have a lingering belief that there is something supernatural in it. Sometimes the phenomena are really remarkable. On one occasion the name of a person wholly unknown to every one in the room except one, and his hands were not in contact with the table, was correctly spelled out. On another the name of a town, of which none present had ever heard, was spelled together with the State in which it was located. Most persons who do not believe that there is any spirit influence, suppose that it is due to electricity. Count Gaspari after repeated experiments in his own family was thoroughly convinced that the spirits had nothing to do with it, but found the presence of a force which he could not explain. Some have called it the Od force. Faraday invented a little instrument called the indicator which registered all lateral movements of the muscles. Wherever it has been applied it recorded the fact that the table has been moved by the muscles of the operators. This movement may be unintentional and unconscious. The quiet sitting for twenty minutes or more brings the party into a state of passivity. Instead of "charging the table," the opera-

\*See Howell's *Undiscovered Country*.

tors are charged. A state of expectation is created and all are ready to yield to slight impressions. The person asking the question is generally supposed to know the answer, and he unconsciously starts the movement and the others equally unconsciously follow. But when he does not know, some one of the party forms an idea of the answer and becomes the leader. The slightest exertion of each when all coöperate is sufficient to make a small table rap.

Latent ideas have found expression. Dr. Carpenter gives a case, and there are many similar ones. It is this: Rev. Mr. Dibdin relates in the *Quarterly Review* the experience of a gentleman who was experimenting with the table. The spirit claimed to be that of the poet Young. It was asked to give some evidence of its identity. This line was spelled out:

"Man was not made to question but adore."

Asked if the line was in *Night Thoughts*, the reply was, "No." Asked "Where then?" the answer was "Job." The gentleman could not recall the fact that he had ever read that poem, but when he referred to his own copy of Young, he saw that he had read it and noted that line. Ideas and even the very words in which they are expressed are often reproduced without recognition.

In some experiments made by the present writer the evidence of unconscious personal influence was very clear. Some questions were asked the answers to which could not have been known to any other person present. In one case a false name was thought of and that was given. In another a fact momentarily forgotten was stated. In another the name of a person living was given as a spirit. He was certainly controlling the table but there was not only no conscious movement but a desire to avoid it.

Of the same general nature of table-rapping but of a higher order is automatic writing. The results are often very remarkable. As an example we take some extracts from an article in the *Christian Register*, of Boston, written by Mrs. Sarah A. Underwood, in which she gives her own experiments and her state-

ments are indorsed by Mr. B. F. Underwood. Mrs. Underwood says of herself that she has "never been a believer in modern spiritualism, nor had more than an ordinary interest in its phenomena or literature; never attended a seance or circle, consulted a medium, heard a rap or witnessed any of the so-called manifestations; never been in a trance or hypnotic condition, nor witnessed anything in the way of mesmerism." The writing occurs when she is in a normal state. The presence of her husband who has no automatic power is necessary to connected writing. The hand writing differs greatly from her own and is done with a rapidity she could never command. She says of the subject-matter: "The thoughts expressed are not mine; they are frequently at variance with opinions I have long held, and I do not know what a sentence or word will be until it has been completed." In some cases the names signed to the messages correspond with the signatures of the persons from whom they purport to come, and that too of those whose hand-writing she had not seen. The messages which she copied from notes taken at the time are remarkable. Only a few can be given.

"Will you give us from your standpoint of knowledge a definition of these words: body, soul and spirit? First, body." *Answer:* "Body, as we understand the word, means a temporary condition of what you name matter, necessary to the development of soul." What then is soul?" *Answer:* "Soul is the ego, the individualization of an atom of the great unity spirit." "How do you define spirit." *Answer:* "Spirit is the all of being, inexplicable to those in the body; you must come up higher to understand." "What do you mean by the atoms of unity? How can there be such when each atom is in itself a whole, a unity?" *Answer:* "E pluribus unum." "On your plane do you arrive at certainty in regard to immortality?" *Answer:* "We here are as ignorant as you are as to ultimate existence. Immortality is still an undetermined issue. One life at a time is as pertinent with us as with you." "Is not every spirit on your plane assured of continued existence?" *Answer:* "Continued existence does not necessarily mean immortality to all men. When the change you call death occurs there is but a

step taken towards the change which annihilates as well as strengthens." "Does the form of man change with change of planes?" *Answer:* "Cannot you understand that your ideas of form are limited by your sense perceptions and you could not understand the correct answer." "What names known to us, of those who in the past were on earth, are accounted your greatest thinkers?" *Answer:* "Individualities are here overwhelmed in the All of Good. We don't care to bolster up universal thinkers' quotients."

The spirit who dictated these answers was a philosophic one. Mr. Underwood, without whose presence there were no responses, is well read in philosophy and especially in that of Herbert Spencer. In him is the true source of the opinions given in the writing. But the manner in which he writes through his wife's hands can not now be explained. Telepathy and thought transference have been suggested as possible explanations of similar phenomena, but as at present understood they do not account for the whole of the facts. If these thoughts had been in the mind of Mr. Underwood at the time the fact would have been stated. If they were not in mind how could there be thought-transference or telepathy. They may have been ideas that Mrs. Underwood had previously considered, even if she had not accepted them, and then been reproduced in a semi-automatic way. The presence of her husband may be necessary to stimulate that kind of philosophic trains.

Dr. Carpenter thinks that this whole class of phenomena may be accounted for by unconscious cerebration. The brain is the organ of thought. Our thoughts depend upon the condition of the brain. States of the brain cause thoughts. Not all of the brain changes come into consciousness, because the mind otherwise occupied does not receive the impressions. The unheard striking of the clock produces the same state of the organs of hearing as when heard, but the mind, attentive to something else, does not note the call, and does not hear. Changes may take place in the brain and be connected with other trains of changes none of which come into consciousness because they do not excite any thought. This is unconscious cerebration.

The cerebral action is purely physical. Such unconscious cerebration must be admitted as a fact established beyond question. But Dr. Carpenter means by it a train of thought carried on by the brain outside of consciousness. The brain cannot think, and that sort of cerebration is impossible. Cerebral changes are associated just as are the thoughts connected with them. One of a series has a tendency to excite the whole of the series. The movement may go on for a time without awakening consciousness when suddenly a thought may be excited. We cannot trace the connection between the two thoughts, because the association which actually occurred was only in the brain. We may fully account for these mental facts without resorting, as Hamilton does, to subconscious thinking. In this way we may explain cases of reproduction of former ideas, as in that related by Mr. Dibdin. But unconscious cerebration does not originate wholly new ideas, and while it may account for a part of the facts given by Mrs. Underwood, it does not explain all of them.

But whatever may remain inexplicable in automatic writings we do know enough to feel perfectly assured that the spirits of the dead are in no way and in no degree connected with them.

Modern spiritualism, judged by its results has nothing to commend it. As a means of knowledge it is worthless. It has made no contribution to either philosophic or religious science. Dr. Koenig heard one of the expounders of its mysteries explain a flame seance which he had just witnessed. "It is awfully simple," said the expositor, "it is nothing but projection. The spirits understand the laws of electric projection; even the electric forces themselves understand the laws of nature and the currents. The electric forces snatch the flames and propel them along invisible wires. There is no such thing as solid substance; matter is permeable to those forces and therefore it is easy to see how a terrapin can come quick as lightning through a wall." And the fortunate terrapin in its rapid transit did not even lose its breath. This luminous explanation is quite in harmony with the utterances of spiritualism on scientific subjects. In philosophy they are restatements of old truths, or opinions without proof, or mere jargon. It has told us nothing

about matter or spirit that had not been already said by some philosophical writer.

As a religion it is the broadest latitudinarianism. It has but one fundamental article in its creed: The soul lives after death and may send messages to friends in the body through mediums. Mr. Howitt finds in these noted mediums the three stages of spiritualism. He says Mr. D. D. Horne represents the preparatory or atheistic stage; Mr. A. J. Davis represents the pagan stage; and Mr. T. L. Harris the Christian stage. But atheistic, pagan and Christian are all alike gathered in a loving brotherhood under spiritualism. It is a chameleon and takes color from the circles in which it appears. With the orthodox it talks in the language of orthodoxy, and with the pantheists it is devoutly pantheistic. Everywhere it is Universalism, for all have hope of final rest. If it has led some from atheism and infidelity to Christianity it has led great multitudes away from the Church. From the standpoint of the Church its influence cannot be judged otherwise than very bad. We are told that its province is not to reveal religious truth as doctrines of faith. What then is its function in religion? What is its place in Christianity, what have Christian people to do with it? Those who have had opportunity to observe its influence on morals agree that it is deleterious. In those who fully accept it there is always a substitution of the communications of the spirits for the Bible, human appointments for the divine institutions and spiritualistic circles for the churches. The sources of moral power are neglected, and there is of necessity a lowering of the moral tone. Spiritualism is often ascribed to Satan. This is doubtless true, not in the sense intended, but in the general one that everything which opposes the Church is of the devil.

## ARTICLE II.

## THE COMMUNION OF SAINTS.

By PROF. J. W. RICHARD, D. D., Gettysburg, Pa.

In the Apostles' Creed we are taught to "believe in the Holy Ghost: the Holy Catholic Church; the Communion of Saints." At intervals during the last few years, the attention of the Church has been called to the article of the Creed which stands at the head of this paper, but, so far as we know, the full results of the very latest historical investigation, have nowhere appeared in English. In the recent controversy over the Apostles' Creed in Germany, the *Communio Sanctorum* came in for its full share of treatment. The investigations of Harnack, Zahn, Kattenbusch and others, confirming and supplementing the labors of Caspari and Von Zezschwitz, have doubtless brought the ultimate attainable facts to light.

In this paper we start with the conclusions reached by Dr. Adolph Harnack, who in Germany is reckoned without exception, the ablest living writer on Church History, and on the History of Doctrine. In his Reply to Dr. Cremer's strictures on his first pamphlet, entitled: "The Apostles' Creed," 1892, Dr. Harnack says: "I have remarked 1, that the origin and original meaning of that addition (*Communio Sanctorum*) is very dark; 2, have said that the expression appears in the Donatistic controversy and in Augustine, and that accordingly it might be expected that it means also in the Creed the same as there, namely, a more distinct explanation to 'Holy Catholic Church'; 3, then I showed that the expression first came into the Creed at a later time (and that too in Gaul), and there was explained by the oldest witness as 'Communion with the real Saints.' Accordingly I have regarded it as 'very probable that the words in the *Gallie Creed* were in fact intended to mean 'Communion with the martyrs and the real saints,' (against Vigilantius), and originally were no explanation of the expression 'Holy Catholic

Church,' but an addition to it (*Fortsetzung desselbe*). I did not take up the well-known explanation of Nicetas of Romantiana, because I am uncertain as to the date and place of that bishop. But even the fact that the opponents of saint-worship, for example, of Faustus of Rigi, had the words in their Creed, I think dare not be mentioned, since it has no bearing on the question of the original meaning in the Creed, for Faustus at all events only recorded the *worship* of saints and relics."\*

We will confine ourselves mainly to these several conclusions.

1. *That the origin and original meaning of the addition is very dark.*

Dr. Zahn of Erlangen, the equal of Harnack in patristic learning, and thoroughly orthodox, says: "The origin and original meaning of the addition (Zusatz) *Communio Sanctorum*, is still dark."† Long ago had Caspari and Von Zezschwitz shown that the expression originally had various meanings and that the corresponding Greek form *κοινωνία τῷ άγιον* means communion in the Lord's Supper; and that even among the Latins, it was so understood, and that Augustine uses the expression *in tendenzloser Ungebung*, that is, casually, or without intending to oppose any one, and *only once*, and that it is found twice in quotations from the Donatistic side. This is about all we know of the origin and original meaning of the expression, or "addition," *Communio Sanctorum*.

2. *That the expression appeared first in the Donatistic controversy, and is found in the writings of Augustine.*

Both Zahn and Kattenbusch confirm this statement by saying that the expression was in use about the year 400. Kattenbusch, who is now regarded as one of the very highest authorities on all matters pertaining to the Creeds, says that about the year 400 the expressions had a two-fold meaning: "Worthy of special attention is the addition which in our German text runs: *die Gemeine der Heiligen*. Whether the Latin expression (*Communio Sanctorum*) can be so translated, may remain unde-

\*Answer, pp. 11, 12.

†*The Apostles' Creed*, p. 88.

dided. That, looked at originally, or 'historically,' it should not be so understood, is to me not doubtful. If we look at the oldest documents in which we meet the expression (they belong to about the year 400) we find there and on subsequently, a double meaning: Either is it here to be understood as stating more certainly the right of saint-worship, in which sense the expression is to be translated 'Communion with the Saints,' (namely, those in heaven). Or it is to be understood as an allusion to the *fullness of the Sacraments of the Church*, which stands open to the 'believer,' thus to him who does not live in excommunication. In this case we must render the words by: 'Sharing in the holy things' (the 'holy things' of the Church).\*\*

Zahn's comment is as follows: "A spiritual community of goods among all members of the Church, is set forth as the goal of the Christian's hope. While here the biblical and old ecclesiastical idea of saints in the sense of members of the congregation, or believers, is manifestly maintained, Faustus of Rigi in this passage of his Creed, thinks of saints in the narrower sense, and takes occasion to speak of the worship of saints and their relics. An explanation of the idea he does not give, for of course *Sanctorum Communio*, cannot be translated by 'Worship of the Saints.' Only this we see: Faustus has narrowed the idea of saints. But, as it seems to me, this remains an isolated case. In a very different direction incline others, who understand *Sanctorum* as neuter, and think of the sacraments, especially the Lord's Supper, and understand by *Sanctorum Communio*, participation in the goods and blessings of salvation presented in the sacraments. So, if I understand rightly, a discourse falsely ascribed to Augustine—a free transformation of the later Apostles' Creed from the old Irish Church, and an old French translation. From this great multiplicity of meanings in the relatively ancient time it is especially evident that the formula itself is very much older than the so widely differing meanings. Already at the time of Nicetas of Romantiana, and fully at the time of Faustus of Rigi, was it an old heir-loom,

\**Zur Würdigung des Apostolicums* (1892) p. 31.

the original meaning of which was no longer clear and certain. Very remarkable is it, that of the ancient expounders of the Creed, not one has ascribed to the words the meaning which unquestionably they had in the African Church diction (Kirchensprache) about 400. Among Donatists and Catholics *Communio* meant church membership, (Kirchengemeinschaft), and indeed also in the concrete sense of this our word. They called the fellowship of orthodox Christians, the Church itself, *Sanctorum Communio*. Thus was it there equivalent to *Congregatio Sanctorum* or *Ecclesia*. If we dared to accept this as the meaning of the like words in the Creed, then would they, as Luther and the Evangelicals generally understand it, be an explanatory appositive to *Sanctam Ecclesiam Catholicam*. But that this was not the original meaning, is probable already from the fact that then the complete disappearance of the original meaning from tradition by about 400, and the exuberant growth of the most diverse meanings in the subsequent times, remains an insoluble riddle. The African usage of words (*Sprachgebrauch*) does not prove anything (ist ohne Beweiskraft), for the reason that the African Church did not have this part in its Creed. The quoted meanings of the words as a part of the Creed, have this in common: They all understand *communio* in an abstract sense. Does not this lie at the root of the uncertain tradition? Moreover, if, for reasons given, this part of the Creed must have been contained in the Creed of some church, and that too unquestionably in a Church of South Gaul, then is it not impossible, but very probable, that the Latin words are a translation of a Greek original. This could scarcely have been other than *την νοιωνιαν των ἀγίων*, which according to Greek ecclesiastical diction, would mean nothing else than 'participation in the holy things.' The faith would here be confessed that in the sacraments and by them, especially in the Lord's Supper, a person really receives the gifts therein presented. For not the sacrament as an act, but the consecrated elements, and the supernatural gifts therein presented, are *τα ἀγία*. It is also, worthy of remark that Augustine, who neither in his native Milan, nor in the African Creed, had *Sanctorum*

*Communio*, in a discourse in which he expounds the former, in the very passage where Nicetas and others speak of *Sanctorum Communio*, speaks of *Communio Sacramentorum*. He boasts that the holy Church in distinction from the Donatistic sect tolerates even the wicked in the communion of the sacraments, and leaves them to the judgment of God. Moreover, since for the same thing he has also used the expression *Sacramentorum participatio*, it looks as though these were different translations for the same Greek original. To the Latin as to the German, an accurate rendering of the Greek *κοινωνία* presents difficulties. If by *τα ἄγια* Greeks would think first of the Lord's Supper, then the universality of the idea renders it still more likely that the gift presented in baptism, and hence both sacraments would be thought of. In many Eastern creeds baptism has a place here. And who would be able to deny that the making mention of the sacraments in the Creed somewhere, and exactly here in connection with the Church, is perfectly in place?\* Zahn proceeds to say that he thinks *it probable* that "this part of the Creed was intended originally to witness the faith in the reality of the sacraments." Harnack, Kattenbusch, Zahn and others testify that the oldest expounders of the Creed take *communio* in the abstract sense of *communion*. No scholar who examines the originals in Nicetas and Faustus could possibly conclude otherwise. Nicetas, after expounding "Holy Catholic Church," says: "Therefore in this one Church believe that you will attain to the communion of the saints (Ergo in hac una ecclesia crede te communionem consecuturum esse sanctorum). And Faustus, after defining the same holy Catholic Church, says: Sequitur, ut transeamus ad communionem sanctorum, that is: "It follows that we pass to the communion of Saints."

All scholars are agreed that the words in question are not found in the forms of the Creed known to Augustine. Nor is it pretended by scholars now that any African usage of the words in question influenced the Gallic usage, or had anything to do with their introduction into the Gallic form of the Creed,

\* *The Apostles' Creed.*

where undoubtedly they first made their appearance in the venerable symbol. The reasoning of Zahn has made it quite probable that they entered the Creed from a Greek source, and originally had reference to the sacraments. The Church in the south of France was of Greek origin. Its greatest bishop, Irenaeus, was a Greek, and the Greek language lingered there for a considerable length of time. At least that the words were used as an independent clause, and not as an exegetical appositive of the preceding clause in the Creed, is historically certain, and, as Harnack justly observes, there is no reason why they should have been introduced as an explanation. All the probabilities as well as the facts, are opposed to such a theory of their origin. Let him who thinks they thus originated, make good his theory by historical facts.

We recur to Augustine. Von Zezschwitz and Zahn are authorities for the statement that *Communio Sanctorum* occurs only once in the writings of this great Latin father, viz., in his fifty-second sermon according to the Benedictine edition of his works.\* Speaking of the Patripassians, he says: *Et removit istos ecclesia catholica a communione sanctorum*; that is, "the catholic church excluded them from the communion of the saints." No violence would be done either to history or to the meaning of words, to translate the words of Augustine thus: The catholic church excluded them from participation of the holy things," or "from partaking of the sacraments." Such a translation is supported by Kattenbusch, and seemingly by Von Zezschwitz, and Zahn's whole argument points in that way. Nevertheless Harnack says that Augustine uses the words as "essentially identical with the empirical Catholic Church." Zöckler says he means by them "the visible Church in this world." That is, Harnack and Zöckler agree as to the way in which Augustine uses the words. Grant that they are correct in their interpretation of Augustine. Then with him the *Communio Sanctorum* is identical with the entire Romish organization of his time, for such was his conception of the Holy Catholic Church,

---

\*They occur twice in lengthy quotations from Donatistic sources.

separated from which no one could be saved, for he declared that although the Donatists had the true baptism, yet they could not be saved, because they did not stand within the Church. It is very certain that this would not suit the Protestant conception of "communion of saints," for not even the boldest Protestant advocate of the epexegetical theory, would like to identify it with the Romish organization, the empirical Catholic Church as known to Augustine, or would like to endorse Augustine's views of the Church, for as Luthardt tells us, "Cyprian's doctrine of the Church"—"more political than religious"—"the Romish idea of the Church, was repeated and defended by Augustine in the controversy with the Donatists, in the sense of a unity founded by the Holy Ghost, but set forth in external organization."\* True, Augustine did lay the foundation for the distinction between the essential and the empirical Church, the Church invisible and the Church visible—"Some are in the house of God in such a way as not to be the house of God itself." "Some are in the house of God in such a way that they do not belong to the structure of the house"—yet he laid the chief stress on the great, visible, historical organism, as Thomasius rightly says, whereas Protestants emphasize the essential, the invisible Church, "the society of faith and the Holy Ghost in the heart," and make membership with the Church conditional upon membership with Christ, and not the converse, which latter is Augustinian and Romish.

But why delay with Augustine? He did not have *Communio Sanctorum* in his Creed, and, as Zahn says, the African usage proves nothing, since *Communio Sanctorum* first appeared in the Creed in Gaul, long after Augustine had passed to his rest.

We now proceed to Harnack's third point.

3. *That the expression came into the Creed in Gaul, that it meant communion with the real saints, and was originally no explanation of Holy Catholic Church.*

(a) That the expression first entered the Creed in South Gaul, is now a settled conviction of scholars. (See Zahn above).

\**Dogmatik*, p. 294.

That it does not appear in the old Roman, the Aquilean, the Milan, the African forms of the Creed is historically certain.

(b) "Probably not only is the oldest explanation of the Creed in which the expression occurs, that of Faustus of Rigi, but he especially furnishes the oldest testimony for the existence of *Communionem Sanctorum* in the Creed."\* This Faustus flourished as bishop of Rigi from 462 to 491. After explaining the Church as the people of God scattered throughout the whole world, agreeing in the one faith, and constituting the one body of Christ, he says: "It follows that we pass *ad Communionem Sanctorum*. This expression confutes those who blasphemously affirm that the ashes of the saints and friends of God are not to be held in honor, (and) who do not believe that the glorious memory of the blessed martyrs, is to be cherished by reverencing the holy shrines."

Two things are apparent here: The expression stands, and is explained, in isolation from the foregoing Holy Catholic Church. The "saints" are real "saints and friends of God," and "the blessed martyrs." That is, the word *has no reference whatever to the empirical Church*, and none to the saints on earth. It was these most potent facts that led Harnack to say: "It must be held as very probable that the words in question were intended really to mean 'communion with the martyrs and real saints.' Hence they were originally no explanation of Holy Catholic Church, but an addition to it." In this judgment Harnack is fully sustained by Kattenbusch (see p. 25). Also as to substance by Zahn, who says: "The oldest expounder of the Creed, of whom it may with tolerable certainty be said, that not only did he employ this idea in this connection, but also had it in his creed, is Nicetas† of about A. D., 400. He seems not to regard the idea as needing an explanation, yet we see that he understands *Sanctorum* of persons, and that too, as the connection shows, of all saints or believers of all ages. Also with him is *communio* an abstract term, a relation of the individual to these saints, thus a communion with them."‡ Hence no explanation

\*Harnack, *Apostles' Creed*, p. 32.

†Harnack refuses to express a judgment on the identity of Nicetas.

‡p. 88.

of "Holy Catholic Church." And by Köstlin: "What do the words mean? Certainly *Sanctorum* is to be understood as masculine, not neuter, as the Greek theologians are accustomed to speak of *κοινωνία τῶν ἁγίων*. No right has any person to take *communio* for *Gemeinde* (congregation) instead of its usual abstract signification of *Gemeinschaft* (communion). Unfounded is the view that in consequence of the Donatistic strife, the words were added to the Catholic confession, and are to be defined in opposition to the Donatistic reproaches and assumptions, as a congregation of saints (despite its unworthy members)."<sup>\*</sup> He then proceeds to say that the meaning is, that a person being in the Catholic Church, enjoys communion with all saints, and shares the common divine blessings. Köstlin wrote about fourteen years ago. Harnack, Kattenbusch and Zahn have published the results of their investigations within the last year. They are unanimous against the old traditional view that Communion of Saints as introduced into the Creed, and as understood by the oldest expounders of the Creed, was meant to be an explanation of "Holy Catholic Church." Indirectly their testimony refutes the notion that Agustine's idea of *Communio Sanctorum*—essentially identical with the empirical Church"—had any influence in shaping the meaning of these words as found in the Creed.

But however "dark the origin and the original meaning of the addition," it is certain that in the latter half of the fifth century, the words were fixed in the South Gallic form of the Creed, with *sanctorum* as a *masculine*, and with *communio* as an abstract noun, the whole denoting fellowship or communion with real saints, and common participation in the blessings of Christianity by all true members of the Catholic Church. Substantially in this sense the addition descended in the Western Church through the Middle Ages, until its meaning was officially determined in the *Catechismus Romanus*, 1566, where, *communio*, as Zahn remarks, is held in the abstract sense. "In the explanation of the Creed the *Catechismus Romanus* does not emphasize the personal saints, but places the communion primarily in communion of

\**Herzog, Real. Encyc.*

the sacraments, and in communion of all the blessings belonging to the Church, and in the mutual communion of love between all the members. Furthermore, Catholicism maintains that 'the communion of the Saints' is the communion of the genuine 'orthodox' Christians generally in the common enjoyment of the spiritual blessings of the Church, but distinguishes between believers on earth, saints in heaven and souls in purgatory, and emphasizes especially the intercourse of these classes.\* The point is, that the Roman Catholic Church, true to the historical use, treats *Communio* as an abstract noun, and emphasizes the *fellowship idea*. That church holds the words as expressing a good in the "Holy Catholic Church," but by no means as defining adequately what the "Holy Catholic Church" is, or as being the perfect equivalent of the latter expression. In 1537 was published the second anti-papal Creed of the Church of England, "The Institution of a Christian Man." It treats the Communion of Saints as a *separate article*, and declares that in the "Catholic Church of Christ, which is his mystical body, there is a perfect communion and participation of all and singular the graces of the Holy Ghost and the spiritual goods and treasures, which do belong unto said whole body, and unto any part or member of the same." After some further explanation in development of the same idea, the "Institution" teaches that the members have communion with each other.

In the Large Catechism (1529) Luther wrote: "The Creed calls the Holy Christian Church '*Communionem Sanctorum*,' a communion of saints—terms perfectly equivalent."† He says also that *communio* should not be translated *Gemeinschaft*, communion, but *Gemeine*, congregation. "To speak proper German it should be called *eine Gemeine der Heiligen*, a congregation of saints." It is doubtful if any German philolgist would justify

\*Küstlin in Herzog, V. p. 58.

†Such is the translation in the New Market edition: More literally it would be: "The Creed names the holy Christian Church *Communionem Sanctorum*, a communion of saints, for the two are understood together as one and the same." Latin: *Utrumque enim idem conjunctim significat.*

Luther's translation of *communio* by the concrete noun *Gemeine*, congregation. It is certain that not a few times he himself has translated *Communio Sanctorum* by *Gemeinschaft der Heiligen*, communion of saints, and time and again do we find this translation in the old Lutheran liturgies, which is evidence conclusive that Luther's contemporaries did not all approve the translation which he gave in the Large Catechism.\* And as for his statement that Holy Catholic Church and Communion of Saints, are perfectly equivalent, it is sufficient to say that the whole history of these latter words in the Creed as briefly sketched above, and the judgment of every competent scholar refutes it. It is historically certain that such words were not introduced into the Creed for the purpose of explaining more accurately what the Church is. Luther is mistaken in a matter of fact. The Creed does not name the Holy Christian (Catholic) Church, *Communionem Sanctorum*. The terms are not perfectly equivalent ("denn es ist beides, einerlie zusammen gefasset"). Moreover, Luther's definition of the two terms as "perfectly equivalent," is out of harmony with his own *explanation* of the latter: "The following, however, is the import and sum of the addition: I believe there is a holy community and congregation on earth, of pure saints, under one head, Christ, called together by the Holy Ghost, in one faith, mind, and understanding, with various gifts—yet concordant in love, free from heresy and dissension." But such is not historically the "Holy Catholic Church" of the Creed, nor is such the Church as it stood fully in Luther's mind. For the Church of the Creed is, undeniably, the empirical, visibly organized church, which is composed of all those who embrace the Gospel and use the sacraments, and which is also the necessary place for the *essential*, the true *invisible* Church, on which Luther laid the chief stress, yet without by any means ignoring the empirical Church, that is, the Church as perceived by the senses.

\*Even Luther himself prefers to abide by the literal and current rendering, for he says: "This I say in order that the words; *Gemeinschaft der Heiligen*, may be understood for they have so come into usage that it would be difficult to remove them, and it would at once be heresy, if a word should be changed." *Large Catechism.*

If now we take Luther's *explanation of Communio Sanctorum*, and then say: "This is 'perfectly equivalent' to 'Holy Christian Church,' or 'the two are understood together as one and the same,'" we have a purely Donatistic conception of the Church, and such, we repeat, was not Luther's full idea of the Church; for while he declared the Church to be *invisible*, and said: "If this article be true, namely, I believe a Holy Christian Church, then it follows that no one can see or feel the Holy Christian Church, nor say, Lo here it is, or there,'" he also recognized the word and sacraments as visible signs of the Church, and declared: "Where thou hearest or seest this word preached, believed, confessed, and then obeyed, there have no doubt that finally in that place there must be a true *ecclesia sancta catholica*, a Christian holy people, though they may be very few. For God's word cannot return void, but must at least have a part of the field,—God's word cannot be without God's people, nor can God's people be without God's word."\* And

---

\*After quoting these passages, Thomasius says: "These last propositions, which are to be explained from his doctrine of the word, complete Luther's view. That which is a note of the Church, is also with him at the same time its life-principle. The word and the sacraments are the means of the Holy Ghost by which the Church is established and kept." And a little further on: "Luther's doctrine is perfectly clear. To him the 'Christian Church' is always the *invisible-visible*." Already at the Leipzig Disputation (1519) he declared that the Church is "the whole body of the predestinated." In his writing against Alved (1520) "he speaks expressly of the invisibility of the Church," says Köstlin; "for what a person believes, that is not bodily nor visible," yet, "where baptism and the Gospel are, no one shall doubt that there are saints, though they should be only children in the cradle." After quoting these passages, Köstlin adds: "In this lies fully the distinction between the *visible* and the *invisible* Church," *Luther's Theologie*, I. p. 320. Well does Neander say: "The distinction of the visible and invisible Church was not taken from the Reformed Church by the Lutheran Church." *Hist. Doct.* II., p. 687. The same is confirmed by Dorner who affirms that the invisibility of the Church had "the entire testimony of the Reformation." Zwingle first made the distinction in his *Commentarius* in 1525. The Church of England impliedly made the distinction in Article XIX., where it speaks of the "visible Church of Christ." And Thomas Rogers in the first exposition of the XXXIX. Articles (1586), discusses, under Proposition I.: "*There is a Church of Christ both invisible and visible.*" He proceeds to establish

sadly enough does Luther deplore the presence of the wicked in the Church. But of course, taught by the word of God, Luther could not approve the papal conception of the Church, as chiefly an external visible organization under the rule of lawful pastors, and especially of the vicar of Christ on earth, with unity of doctrine, sameness of constitution, and uniformity of worship as its notes. Yet he could say, and did say: "We confess aright in the Creed, when we say: We *believe* a holy Christian Church; for it is *invisible*, lives in the spirit, at a place whither no man can come. Therefore its holiness cannot be seen. For God so hides and conceals it with weakness, sins, errors, manifold sufferings, and offenses, that we can nowhere find it with our senses." And again: "This part: 'I believe a Holy Christian Church, is as much an article of faith as the others.' And again: 'The Church is such a high, deep, secret thing, that no one can know or see it, but must lay hold of and believe it in baptism, the sacrament and word,'"\* thus fully recognizing the Holy Christian Church as both invisible and visible,—invisible in its life in the Spirit, visible in its weaknesses and errors, and in its means of grace.

Neither could Luther approve in full the then current conception of the *Communio Sanctorum*. He could not believe that he held communion with "souls in purgatory." But holding on to the masculine of *Sanctorum* as "of *Saints*," both in heaven and on earth, and *communio*, as an abstract noun, "*communion*,"

this proposition from the word of God. The greatest of the English theologians, Ridley, Jewell, Hooker, Barrow, Usher *et al.*, make the distinction. Of the Lutheran Dogmaticians, Dorner says: "All (Hutter, Gerhard, Baier, Hollatius, &c.,) insist upon its invisibility, because its members *ratione fidei et electione* are known to God alone. At the same time, however, they embrace its visibility, and deny that from this twofold distinctions a twofold church arises." *Hist. Prot. Theol.* II., p. 165. In England the Puseyites and *Lux Mundi* people, and in Germany the now defunct party of the "New Lutherans," have sought to obliterate this distinction in the interest of a "priestly character" of the ministry," "the sacraments as the central point of the Lutheran System," "private confession and absolution," etc. See Dorner's *Hist. Prot. Theol.*, II., 404, 487, et seq.

\*Quoted from Walther's Baier's *Compend.* III., 649.

he could and did *explain*: "Of these I also am a part and member, partaker and co-partner of all the blessings they have, brought thither and introduced by the Holy Ghost, because I have heard and still hear the word of God, which is the first step towards entering in,"—again a very different conception from that of the historical "Holy Christian Church," and yet one in full harmony with the doctrine of the communion of the saints, as the same is taught in the Holy Scriptures, and one not wholly foreign to the fundamental idea contained historically in the *Communio Sanctorum*, which is that there is a real communion between all the *saints* in the Holy Christian Church, and a common participation of the blessings of Christianity, among which are hearing one Gospel, sharing the same sacraments, and receiving alike the forgiveness of sins, the resurrection of the dead, and the life everlasting\*—which can be fully enjoyed only in connection with the "Holy Christian Church," but which must be clearly distinguished from the "Church."

Thus by tracing "the addition" historically we are able to affirm very positively that the Creed does not call the "Holy Christian Church," *Communionem Sanctorum*, and that the terms are not perfectly equivalent, that the latter is not, and was not introduced for the purpose of being an epexegetical appositive of the former, that the two expressions are distinct, though closely connected momenta of the Christian faith, that in order to enjoy the blessings of the latter, one must be a member of the former, because to the Holy Christian Church has been given

\*After giving the definitions of the Church contained in the Augsburg Confession and Apology, Guericke says: "Always in very close connection with the *Communio Sanctorum* of the Apostles' Creed, yet this '*Gemeinschaft der Heiligen*' is by no means to be understood as merely epexegetical to the preceding 'Church.' Much rather does the expression 'Church' in the Creed seem to designate the invisible—visible Church on earth in general in its totality, but '*Gemeinschaft der Heiligen*' the invisible essence of the Church, and of course of the whole Church on earth and in heaven in particular, probably the latter as the basis of the former. (In like manner also '*Gemeinschaft der Heiligen*' is followed by 'forgiveness of sins—the proper connection between what precedes and what follows, yea, two things bound in unity—as basis again of *Gemeinschaft der Heiligen*. *Symbolik.*, p. 612.

directly and immediately the power and authority to preach the Gospel and to administer the sacraments, through which as means the Holy Ghost begets real saints. The two "terms," or better, the things for which they stand, are objects of faith. No man can see that inner spiritual essence of the Church, which constitutes her real and abiding self.\* He must believe that it is. No man can see that mystic bond of fellowship, which binds all the children of God, of all times and places, in the common participation of the blessings of redemption. He must believe that it is. Alike can we say: I believe a Holy Christian Church, I believe a Communion of Saints. Or, better still, we can write the Creed, and punctuate, and say it: "I believe in the Holy Ghost; the Holy Christian Church; the Communion of Saints; the Forgiveness of Sins; the Resurrection of the Body; and the Life Everlasting. Amen."

\*Very beautifully has Thomasius said: "Invisible are the two factors of the Church, the Spirit of the Lord living in her, and the life of faith wrought by the same; invisible, because spiritual and internal, is that which we name the essence of the Church; invisible also is that which operates in the means of grace and sets them in motion, if we consider them on the side according to which they are the organs of Christ's activity in the application of redemption, or as manifestations of the Church's life. By no means is this invisibility an ineffective thing; much rather does it form the proper *self* of the Church. It is her spiritual heart and soul, and the Spirit is reality, is life."—*Christi Person und Werk*, III., p. 351.

## ARTICLE III.

## PAUPERISM AND CHARITY.

By REV. J. C. CALDWELL, D. D., Springfield, Ohio.

The aim of this paper is of a most unpretentious character. No more is proposed to be done than to give a sketch of the history of the cry for help, and of the response to that cry. The history of pauperism and charity runs back beyond the building of the Pyramids. It is a problem with which all civilizations have struggled, and whose solution is a struggle which must be transmitted to the future. A certain proportion of the human race is a failure, a certain other proportion merely makes a living, a minority only is beyond the reach of care or anxiety as to what they shall eat and wherewithal they shall be clothed. Those who make a living and those who are above carking care are compelled to feed and keep "The failures." This state of things has always been, and because it has always been, many are ready to fold their hands and to accept the inevitable, namely, that pauperism is one of the ills which flesh is heir to. A nobler heartedness, however, has never been willing to entertain this gloomy view, and has been at work all down the ages to alleviate the sorrows of distressing poverty and to stem the rising tide of what should be called criminal pauperism.

An account of what human benevolence has done to bless and cheer the unfortunate would fill volumes; indeed it would not be possible to tell the whole story. Yet careful, patient study of this history, so far as it can be done, is of the greatest importance in the solution of the problem of pauperism and charity. This history has lessons of warning which must be heeded by the philanthropist, lessons of help that minimize difficulties, and lessons of positive instruction which point the way to final success in working out one of the greatest puzzles of human life and society. We are living in a time when the question of pauperism and charity demands attention as never

before. Communism, Socialism, Nihilism, and the festering elements of Anarchism are just so many phases of the struggle for existence. In antagonism to these powers of darkness, which drag down and destroy, are marshaled the hosts of heaven and humanity which elevate and save. The prophecy of victory is on the side of humanity and heaven; but the prophecy will not receive its fulfillment without the preceding contest and warfare. An investigation of what has been done to relieve the distress of poverty reveals this fact worthy of notice, that, if anything at all is to be done for the poor, it is to be done only for the poor of one's own nationality. This is a principle discovered to be common to men under all governments, patriarchal, monarchical, tribal, democratic, or what not. Jesus only used the words of all men untaught by him when he said to the woman of Syro-Phoenicia: "It is not meet to take the children's bread, and to cast it to dogs." In a great lecture an eminent scholar puts it thus: "The prevalent tendencies of the ethnic civilizations has been to restrict and localize affection and to discourage sympathy." Another has said: "Neither the religion nor the philosophy of Greece and Rome tended to comfort the poor. The divinities were cruel; the Stoic affected to despise the sufferings of the indigent; the Epicurean took no thought of them. Throughout the vast region of Mogul India, and China, the use of hospitals is unknown to this day;" except, it is to be added, as the people of those nationalities have had founded and have had maintained for them hospitals by those who believe in and follow the Lord Jesus Christ.

We begin our brief sketch with the Scandinavians. In Norway and Sweden a tax is levied for the support of the poor. Concerning one method of the direct care of the poor the account of Paul du Chaillu is sufficiently interesting to be reproduced here. "While chatting at one of the houses an old man entered, dressed in a new suit of clothes, and wearing a high silk hat, and was bidden to take a seat: when, upon inquiry, it was whispered in my ear that he was a pauper I could hardly believe it. In some parishes the people prefer to have no poor-houses, as there are very few paupers. Each person who has

to be supported has to prove before the Haradsting that he is too old or infirm to work; then he goes and remains six days on every farm in the parish. I was surprised to see how kindly they were treated—in many instances like visitors—having better food than that daily used by the family, and a good bed: and so they go from one farm to another. They are well cared for, for it would be a disgrace if the report should spread that Farmer-so-and-so was hard-hearted to the poor. It sometimes happens that a man is not able to provide for his wants, from imbecility or other cause; in that case the authorities of the parish make arrangements with some of the farmers to pay a fixed sum annually, stipulating what kind of labor the man may undertake, which is generally to tend the sheep or cows, split wood, draw water, or, in a word, make himself useful in a small way. They think this system less demoralizing than that of the poor-house."

The little country of Greece, great in history and greater in the character of her people of this day than is generally known, has no poor law, no poor taxes, no paupers, and no associations established for charity. Beggars are rare, and absolute destitution is said to have no existence in all the land.

In Italy, while the great mass of the people are engaged in agricultural pursuits, an unusually large proportion of the inhabitants are congregated in towns and cities. The Italian is no lover of the country district, and farmers and laborers are huddled together in their squalid boroughs and hamlets, often having to travel several miles before they reach the fields they cultivate. In consequence of this evil and of other evils, pauperism in its most painful and disgusting forms is widely spread in Italy. Yet in Italy there is no poor law, no poor tax; and all paupers are made to depend on voluntary charity. Hence Italy is a land of beggars. There are indeed many institutions to supply the wants of the poverty-stricken, of the diseased, and of the infirm, but there is no organized effort in Church or State to mitigate the miseries of the unfortunately or wickedly poor.

In 1876 France had a population of 36,905,788. France has  
VOL. XXIV. No. 1. 6

no poor law, but charitable establishments, either private or created and managed by the State are very numerous, and are said, to a large extent, to be very efficient. Orphans' houses receive infants which neither parents nor friends care for, and oftentimes do not acknowledge; infant schools give shelter and the first elements of education to poor children whose mothers must earn their daily bread; young girls of the destitute class may learn a trade in one of the workshops freely open to them in many of the towns, though too often these poor girls earn their living in shame; and lads may find employment in many of the agricultural colonies of the country. Besides these and other charities there are charities supported by the government to a greater or less extent. Notwithstanding all, it must be confessed that the means of help for the poor of France is inadequate, and that her million of paupers are a sore on her body politic, which, with all her civilization, she has not yet been able even to give the promise of healing.

The German Empire is composed of so many small states, about three hundred, each having its own local government, manifesting such a variety of method in the disposal of social and domestic questions, that it is impossible to give any clear account, in this paper, of the condition of pauperism or of the doings of charity in that great country. Elberfeld, a manufacturing town in Prussia, has in operation a system of charity which deserves more than a mere notice. In 1823, when the Prussian Government authorized each commune of the Dusseldorf Circle to take charge of its own poor, Elberfeld set on foot its own plan. "The town was divided into sixty visiting districts, but the Lutherans, the wealthiest community of the city, were permitted to take charge of their own poor. The visitors were too few, their duties were neglected, expenditure increased, and the prospect was alarming. Every twelfth person was a pauper, and the cost of relief in 1852 was \$44,650, while in the Lutheran community it was thirty per cent. higher than in the rest of the city. The existing scheme was then authorized. It has a central Board consisting of a president, four councillors, and four citizens, all appointed by the town council. Under this

Board are eighteen overseers, each with fourteen visitors, all of whom are unpaid. All are recommended for appointment by the citizens of the several districts, and bound by law to serve. The visitors of each district meet fortnightly under the presidency of the overseer, and submit a report of each application for and disbursement of relief. In accordance with minute rules each case is decided by a majority vote, subject to an appeal to the overseer. The general administrative body meets on the alternate weeks, and hears reports from the overseers, receives estimates and makes appropriations for each district, investigates the condition of the poor and the special causes of pauperism, as well as the means not only of relieving but of preventing it.

The instruction is very elaborate. It excludes from relief persons who have relatives bound by law to assist them, and this obligation extends to connections by marriage. It excludes those in receipt of private charity, but in practice private may be supplemented by town aid up to a fixed standard. In accepting aid the applicant passes under the surveillance of the visitor, who visits him frequently, notes the changes in his circumstances, urges him to find work, and, in the failure to do so, assigns him employment. If the pauper refuse his allotted task, waste the relief granted to him, or is idle, drunken, or dissolute, his maintenance may be reduced; and until recently he was liable to imprisonment. The poor-house is really the refuge for the aged and infirm. The result of this system has been, that, while from 1852 to 1869 population increased from 50,000 to 71,000, the number of paupers declined from 4,000 to 1,062, and the expenditures declined from \$44,650 to \$19,300. The German plans all agree in these points: In each city there is but one charitable organization; voluntary effort is joined with official; each tributary society aims not at expending its resources, but at making them the last resort of the poor; it individualizes each case and adjusts the treatment to its circumstances; it employs a large number of friendly visitors to be the counselors of the unfortunate, and, by these means, to make the experience and character of the respected available for the depressed; it en-

forces education; it stimulates the sense of family responsibility; it compels the pauper to work; it insists that the acceptance of relief carries with it the obligation of complete confidence, and of compliance with the judgment of its grantors; it avowedly seeks to understand and remove the causes of pauperism, not by general social reformation but by specific and individual reformation.

When we cross the North Sea and visit England we find ourselves in the country of charities and charities. No country in all the world is so rich in charitable institutions of every description as is Great Britain. It is estimated that \$50,000,000 are raised annually in England for the relief of poverty and pauperism. In 1886 the Trustees collected for the poor rates about \$69,426,010. In the same year the whole number of paupers in the United Kingdom was about 728,350. Two-thirds of all these were sane adults, the other third comprising children under sixteen years of age, lunatics, and idiots. Among the adult in-door paupers the men formed the majority, but among the out-door paupers the women were nearly three times as numerous as the men. In the United Kingdom pauperism is far more costly than crime.

The methods of meeting the urgent demands and pleading necessities of the hosts of the poor are many and various. Of taxes I have already written. Then there are the hospitals which often do more than administer to injury and disease; some educate or train those who come under their care. Multitudes of other charitable institutions are trying to turn back the increasing flood and flow of pauperism. None, however, of the expedients that have been tried have been as successful as that of Doctor Chalmers in Glasgow, Scotland; and that of Miss Octavia Hill in London, England.

In 1820 Doctor Chalmers was called to preach in the parish of St. John in Glasgow. His chief reason for accepting the call to this parish, having ten thousand people under its care, was that he might try some of his long thought-out plans as to the relief of the poor. He began his work in the most discouraging circumstances, and amid all that was forbidding. The

principles on which he worked were these: First, the habit of giving aid without careful investigation in every case, and the existence of a fund from which aid can be freely drawn, destroy in the poor the strongest of all natural incitements to help themselves which operates when a man knows that if he does not work, or thoughtlessly squanders, he and his family must starve. Second, that wrong methods dry up the springs of family and neighborly aid which, if kept open, would very largely provide for the necessities of every worthy case. Aid was never granted where work could be secured instead, nor until neighborhood resources had been drawn upon to the uttermost; and drunkenness was made an absolute bar, on the ground of its being an evidence of means.

After having secured from the officials of Glasgow their consent to withdraw all public aid from his parish, and to leave the entire care of the poor within his church to him and his co-workers, Dr. Chalmers divided the parish into twenty-four districts, placing each district under the charge of one of his deacons. With no other funds than certain church collections he undertook the task. At the end of three years and a half the results were thus summarized: From a parish embracing one-tenth of the city of Glasgow, and that tenth composed of the poorest of the population of the city, the whole flow of pauperism into the Town Hospital, which furnished both out-door and alms-house relief, was intercepted, and a work which had hitherto cost the city \$7,000 a year was accomplished for \$1400 a year. In addition, the condition of the poor within the parish was so improved that a steady stream of poor people from other parishes, attracted by the comfort of their fellows, flowed into the parish of St. John.

In 1832 a commission appointed by the Crown to examine into the state of affairs of the poor of Great Britain, made the following report concerning Dr. Chalmers' experiment just described. The report says: (1) Industry has been restored and improved. (2) Frugal habits have been created and strengthened. (3) Permanent demand for labor has increased. (4) The increase has been such that wages, so far from being de-

pressed by the increased amount of labor in the market, have in general advanced. (5) The number of improvident and wretched marriages has diminished. (6) Discontent has been abated, and the moral and social condition of the poor has in every way improved. Strange to say, Dr. Chalmers' experiment has remained, to very recent times, the almost unheeded demonstration of both the chief evil under which the poor suffer, and of the true method of their relief.

In 1864 Miss Octavia Hill, acting as the almoner of John Ruskin, purchased two tenement houses in the most unsightly part of the East End of London. These, and many other tenements which Miss Hill has since purchased, she has transformed, by adherence to a few wise rules, into orderly, clean, respected, and self-respecting communities. The rules from which Miss Hill never varied are: "To insist inexorably upon payment of rent when due, never in a single instance allowing a second rent day to follow one unpaid: To help by work when possible rather than by money or goods: To stimulate tenants by improvement in their tenements, based on their care of the property: To set them the example of scrupulous cleanliness in those parts of the building that remain under the landlord's control: To throw upon every occupant the responsibility of ordering his own life, and making his own decisions: To extend to all the personal sympathy and counsel that would arouse each to energetic effort: To study as far as possible each life, and so to meet the wants of the individual."

In 1869 the London Society for Organized Charity and Repressing Mendicity was instituted. Its main principle of work is thorough investigation before relief, investigation being the discriminative test between imposture and destitution, and procuring assistance adequate to render the applicant independent of future aid. It does not desire to be a relieving agency, but to direct the benevolent forces of the community into efficacious channels. The results of the Society's work are to be sought in the abatement of the poor-rate, in the reduced expenditure of other charitable institutions, in the diminished number of

mendicants, and in the arrest of many in progress toward pauperism and vice.

Little space is left to say anything concerning pauperism and charity in the United States. This is to be said, that the work of Dr. Chalmers, and the methods of Miss Octavia Hill have been copied and improved in this country to a wonderful extent. Indeed, the United States are going ahead of all other countries in the best methods of managing and relieving the poor. At this point the descriptive part of my paper must be concluded in what may seem to be a very abrupt manner. If another paper should be written it would be devoted to an account of pauperism and charity in America. All I now do is merely to mention and to give emphasis to a few points which I believe to be worthy of consideration.

I. It is the judgment of those in England, who have investigated and observed most closely the methods of pauperism and charity, that the multiplication of charitable institutions in that country has served to foster idleness among the lower classes in the large towns, and thus has swelled the ranks of hereditary pauperism. Poor-rates have diminished the kindness of the poor to each other, and have made the rich more lavish as they have been removed from all contact with the poor.

II. Pauperism must not be regarded, by either the pauper or the charity-giver, as a necessity, any more than disease or ignorance is a necessity. We are hourly aiming at the cure of disease, we are striving to dispel ignorance; so we must bring society to the place where pauperism will not exist.

III. That charity which bestows a gift more for the sake of the giver than for the sake of the receiver is a miscalled charity, and should be named the meanest and most hurtful kind of selfishness.

IV. Wide observation and long-continued and patient experience have settled the fundamental principle of all successful charity: *Personal investigation of each individual pauper's case.* A writer has put it well in saying, "Deal with this man by himself, and for his own sake. Recognize that, with him and all of his class, it is the soul, the heart, the mind, the will, that are

famishing rather than the body, and seek to start a new life and power of effort from within."

V. It is to be emphasized with the greatest force that the giving of indiscriminate alms is an immoral act. The giving of meals and money to tramps is morally wrong. The responding to the call of any able-bodied man or woman for help without knowing or seeking to know the real state of each is not being benevolent, it is being selfish in the most harmful way. I use now the words of one who has studied thoroughly this whole subject: "In speaking of giving indiscriminate alms without inquiry let me say it is purchasing one's ease at the price of another's injury. It is generous selfishness. Except the public dole, no one agency is doing so much to injure the poor to-day as this indiscriminate and incessant alms-giving. It promotes hypocrisy and lying. It cuts the sinew of all worthy ambition. It undermines character. It destroys natural affection among the poor. It dries up the springs of mutual helpfulness among the poor, and it paralyzes the efforts of the givers themselves as they find themselves again and again to be the victims of incessant deceit and imposture." Edward Denison of England, whose experience on this whole subject is as great as that of any living man, says: "I am beginning seriously to believe that all bodily aid to the poor is a mistake; whereas by giving alms you keep them permanently crooked."

VI. I am persuaded much of the teaching of the Bible on the subject of charity is sadly misunderstood. The understanding and the practice of charity with too many is the result of the perversion of monasticism and of the misinterpretation of the scholasticism of the Middle Ages. The word is explicit: "Work with your own hands." "This we commanded you, that if any would not work, neither shall he eat."

VII. All true charity in the history of the world is the offspring of the religion of Jesus Christ. He first taught the world the common brotherhood of man, finding its centre and sun and inspiration in the glorious fatherhood of God.

## ARTICLE IV.

## THE THRUST OF IDEAS.

By PROF. M. H. RICHARDS, D. D., Allentown, Pa.

I have been somewhat of a builder of houses,—on paper! The art is a pleasant combination of the subjective and objective; it has enough of the first element to make it facile, and of last to make it serious. Your “castle in Spain” is too confessedly subjective to be a serious work: you know that it is an airy nothing from turret to foundation stone; and you are apt to begin at the top and build it down toward the mud-sill, which, if you attempt to suppose it, dissolves the baseless fabric of your dreams, just as when a bubble strikes some solid substance.

Real objective building is too serious; and likewise expensive! But to prepare a plan on paper seriously intended for a real building, viewed under limitations of locality, material, cost, adaptability to end, is certainly a fascinating occupation. It is redeemed from all trifling by its final cause; its reasonableness is verified by reference again and again to actual dimensions of really existing houses and apartments; its individuality is assured by your being an amateur, and your own needs and requirements being the modulus; and when you take your plans to the professional builder and it is conceded that they will make a very fair house, you are rejoiced with exceeding joy.

I have thus planned several houses whose final forms have been materialized and have prov'd habitable, and are inhabited even unto this day. But I must confess, as one not unduly elated by such triumphs, that I have always halted my vaulting ambition when I came to the roof! I never plan the roof, but leave that to the professional architect who translates my sketch into a working plan set forth in the language of the mechanic. A roof is as embarrassing as it is necessary: you cannot have

a house without it, and yet it is harder to imagine in proper form, in relation to the specific house, than any other part of it.

The difficulty about roofs is their thrust! They press down with a weight which crushes either themselves or the walls beneath them, or else they push outward with a force sufficient to disjoint every joist and cast down the walls thus torn asunder. They must be strong enough to endure the stress of weather, pitched for shedding rain and snow, yet not too heavy nor yet too light, neither too steep nor too flat, not of too long a span, and yet of necessity long in the rafter; in a word, they are paradoxical;—you cannot do without them, and yet you do not know how to do with them!

Roofs seem to me the best analogy through which to set forth "ideas." Ideas too are paradoxical: you must have them, and yet they are, at times, deadly weapons. Lowell has said that they have bayonet points; and another has likened them to dynamite: I compare them to the roof with its unsuspected downward and lateral thrust, which destroys that which it completes, that which it may have erstwhile preserved. Men and nations are not truly such without their individual and national ideas; and yet both are ruined by their ideas. Emphasis has too often been laid upon material causes of prosperity or adversity: I would lay it upon this thrust of ideas, tearing apart and crushing down the material strength, the walls beneath.

There is much analogy, all the way through, between a house and a nation; both have foundation, walls, stories, stairways, and roof; and both must have locality and respect to environment. You cannot have a nation just anywhere; and "just anywhere" is no place for a house. You cannot have a Greek nation in the Canadian Northwest; and a Grecian temple there would be just as absurd and short-lived. You have no roof, properly speaking, until you reach civilization; and you have no nation, in any practical sense, until you reach the same stage. The house is a projection of human idea, and its materialization: It is the third encasement of the spirit embodied. First comes the body itself, then the raiment, and, thirdly, the house as a human abode. The roof of the house is the climax and acme of human idea-

tion, in this direction. And ideas are the final need and the perfecting of national life. You have material and natural factors, the spontaneous and the elaborated and acquired; your nation builds up its walls by choice and use of simple facts, material industries; it rises into the higher stories of art and science; it puts on at last a sky-parlor and roofs it over with ideas, and loads it down with its fancies evolved into a roof-garden. Then it is perfected; or, if its ideation is evil, it is speedily ruined by the deadly thrust of the ideas, and collapses in the midst of material abundance, and becomes chaotic with all its arts and sciences helpless to uphold it. In fact, the more machinery there is in a building, the more goods stored within it, the greater the crash when its downfall takes place.

But what do we mean by "ideas?" It is certainly a most reasonable demand that we define the word and set forth the sense in which it is used. "Idea" is so indefinite, so variable in its meaning, from time to time, in one school and in another. Philosophers do not agree with one another in their usage of it, and popular use does not agree with them. He who says, "I have an idea," or, it may be, "I have a sort of notion," does not thereby declare that he is possessed of a well-rounded, distinctly organized percept, much less that it is the fruit of ap-perception, or that he has risen thoughtfully and reflectively from particulars to the universal concept. He means just what he says; that there floats before his mind's eye a vision in outline, dim, though glorious it may be, as moonshine, the kind of thing one reaches out to clutch in feverish delirium only to bury his finger-nails in his own bleeding palms.

Men are governed, and so are nations, by these unverified "ideas," often irreconcilable with facts; and when they proceed to act upon them they have roofed nine inch walls with lead and iron: the higher the wall, the more imperious the idea, the deadlier the thrust, the more complete the overthrow. It might seem that national life, with all its recorded and often related experience, would necessarily develop its ideas out of and in strict accord with the facts of its existence and thus inevitably, constitutionally, conform its roof to its walls, and insure perennial

duration. But such a conclusion is itself an "idea," a mere emotional patriotism whose lateral thrust is as ruinous as any other you may name!

What! do you conclude that because we fire off tons of "villainous gunpowder" each recurring Independence Day, that therefore our liberties are safe, and every boy with burnt fingers has become a statesman and a patriot? As well believe that similar explosions heralding in the New Year, and "shooting off the Old Year," do make the spiritual atmosphere wholesome, disinfecting it of all those spirits that otherwise would walk of nights malevolently minded toward man and beast. Let him who would be disillusionized consider the quality of national legislation, and note whether national ideas reflect the experiences of the past, grow out of inductions from facts, become continuously wiser and safer!

The fact is that we do not put national experiences upon record, to any great extent, in any clear form of cause and effect. Another fact is that only the few, and not the many, read such meagre records as we have, or care to have them read to them. Witness, in proof of this, the disuse of the "Declaration of Independence" as a stock-piece for our Fourth of July celebrations! Who wants to know what it is, or what it declares? Certainly, not the "patriotic" many who explode the day and fire-work the night! We put dramatic incidents into narrative and oration, we thus perpetuate the "drum and trumpet" parts of our history, but we neglect to inculcate their very essence of worth, their why and wherefore, their whence and whither, and the unwilling audience those get who strive to do it chills our ardor to attempt it.

Again, one generation does not learn from the experience of another, in any lively degree. There are low doorways in old houses against whose lintels four generations have successively bumped their heads, as they attained their majority and stature; and there are back stairways down which every baby in all these generations rolled once or twice just as inevitably as it came to its crawling age. Man is a creature who forgets, as a series: and remembers only, though not always, as an individual. Each

generation persists in trying to roof with the idea that proved a wall crusher a generation or so before it, and refuses to listen to the few who warn that this has been tried before with ruinous result. One is forced to conclude that our "statesmen" read little; and our voters, as a body, less or nothing: they feel, get the idea of pain, resent, and revolutionize.

The motive power of an idea depends in no way upon its objective qualities: it is determined solely by the subjective fervor and belief. Men do not stop to question, when full of an idea, and will not allow themselves to be halted; action must ensue at once, and he who leads off most vigorously is followed, not he who counsels most wisely. Temporary insanity, or emotional insanity, is a plausible explanation of some such movements: the nation was captivated by an idea wild enough to make one crazy who entertained it, went crazy, and stayed crazy until they danced down their walls by vibrating their idea in maddest variations. What else shall we say of the French Revolution and its orgies!

The birth and growth of such an idea is a curious study! Even in its milder form of "spirit of the times" (*Zeit geist*) it is as perplexing as interesting: for it is much easier to diagnose correctly what disease a man, or a nation, has than to tell how it was contracted. For however single the effect may be, the cause is always complex; as, indeed, the effect is just as likely to prove. But as the effect causeless does not come, one ought to assign some causation for even the wildest effect, if it be nothing more satisfactory than indigestion of rich diet, abuse of prosperity, rebound of slavery, starved dreams, the nemesis of misrule.

One does see that the popular idea is too often but "the wish which is father to the thought." The physically weary and materially poor cannot realize that there may be a mental weariness and a spiritual poverty where wealthy ease rises before them. Their false ideation of the rich runs on to envy and malice, the soil in which the agitator readily sows a mushroom growth of riots and assassinations. Could the laborer get the full idea of what it means to be rich, could he form the field of mental vis-

ion which fills in the picture with all its details, could he perceive that perfect misery may inhabit perfectly appointed apartments, that sorrows and bitterness cannot be warded off by great rent-rolls, he might pity, sympathize, fear for himself so sad a fate.

One finds strange survivals of race traits which seem to be instinctive, persistent, and indifferent to change of circumstances. Again and again they assert themselves in the race, without reason or against reason, just as meaningless in the new environment as a dog's turning round and round before he lies down upon the freshly brushed and shaken hearth rug. There was a time when the instinct meant self-preservation and due precaution against danger: now the instinct remains simply as an idea by heredity. Yet those who entertain it are conservative of it with a stubborn devoutness almost fanatical. Such often are those who perpetuate holy days by keeping holiday upon them; and those over whose doors hangs the horse shoe, the empty halo of a forgotten saint.

Many an idea is nothing more than "that strange spell, a name!" What is it more, politically, for the greater part which is gathered together shouting and voting for their "Diana of the Ephesians?" At home, they were "against the government," perhaps for good reasons; in this new land of their immigration they are also against the government, for no reason. In their youth they imbibed the idea from their elders that it was right and good to be a "Democrat" or a "Republican," whatever that meant; and so they have been ever since, true to the name, and knowing as little now as then what it means or whether it means the same now as then. So it is with religion as with politics. The name carries, gives birth to an idea, which is cherished but never examined. Blessed consistency, "sancta simplicitas!"

But why smile contemptuously at the idea of the ignorant and the lowly? What is "society" so-called but an equally vulgar idea? What shall we say of the man or woman who does this and that because believing that "it is the proper thing?" What about the intellectuality of classifying people by their descent from deserving ancestors as therefore and thereby them-

selves deserving? Did these descendants choose their ancestors? Have they acquired their characters, imitated their deeds, or what, or how? Yet these are the *forbés*, the ideas, of the refined and the intelligent! What a roofing-over all such ideas are to weigh and press and thrust upon the walls we build! It is a wonder they stand up under them.

It is fortunate for some people that they only construct their roofs on paper and never actually apply them to the walls: it is this which we mean by saying that a man's life is better than his creed. Did they actually apply, had they vigor enough to act out and act up to their ideas, what a speedy crash would follow! Yet what a miserable and unfinished affair a life is that has no dominant idea, no perfected finish to it: it is a partly constructed house temporarily roofed over with foreign material. No, we must have these ideas, must finish up with them really applied, whatever the danger bound up in their choice.

But it is a great error to suppose that the most part do not apply their ideas: the existence of so many walls out of plumb proves that they do; and the sight of others shored up by relatives and friends; and the dismantling of those whom the law orders down, by imprisonment, before they fall to the hurt and harm of bystanders and neighboring so-journers. No, ideas do thrust; they press upon many a wall to the verge of crushing which seems to stand up securely all the while. No man is safe from ideas: they will and must drive him onward. The man who is better than his creed usually ends by getting down to its level, or changing it for a better one and a safer one. It is not necessary that we be conscious of an influence to be under its operation. Sometimes the sign of its operativeness is seen in the stout denial of the victim that he is sensitive at all to it. He who denounces the pride of the rich is often the one who worships wealth the most; and is bitter because he has failed to acquire it. Ideas are as deceitful as they are dangerous,

The idea that ideas are of little account, and that prosperity is almost entirely a matter of managing material resources, is one of these same deceitful dangers. Just because we are especially liable to it in our land of material opportunity, the dan-

ger needs repeated pointing out. We have greater talent enlisted in our material operations than in any other. As a rule, our political leaders are not as able as our railroad magnates and greatest business men. Our best legal talent is enlisted under this same banner as counsel and advisors: science spends its greatest force in cheapening mechanical and chemical appliances for greater money making. It does not seem to enter into the minds of any that a nation's wealth does not insure its safety, perpetuate its worth, establish justice, promote domestic tranquility.

Let us see what history deposes as to this! Rome has left us her history and has figured so grandly that she is called into court at every turn; but we cannot, for that very reason, do without her testimony. If she had a dominant idea it was that of universal conquest. She was to rule the world and feast upon booty. That idea drove her onward until by the confession of her rulers the empire had become too vast for safety or profit. But the idea remained dominant and active and thrust even harder and harder. There could be but one end, and it came! Rome crumbled to pieces under the pressure of her national idea. Having conquered all else, her great men, great in this idea, turned upon one another. Then the barbarian caught the idea from her in turn, and finished up what they had begun. That which began under a Romulus and found its zenith in an Augustus, ended in disastrous eclipse with a Romulus Augustulus!

Greece is another witness just as universally summoned, as being intellectual, artistic, philosophical, less material. But Greece had her dominant idea of preserving the balance of power, and thus securing state sovereignty. That idea was stronger in its thrust than any manifest need of union for common protection. Faction fight and rivalry did their worst unchecked, and barbarian Philip subdued all these cultured Greeks, and equally barbarian Rome put an end to all these miserable sovereignties and this balanced weakness.

On the other hand, who can think of a dominant idea without naming Israel as a nation existing simply and solely because

of such a power. "We are a peculiar people;"—that is the sole bond and the sufficient one. The Jew is in all lands, having none of his own; he speaks all languages, yet retains his own ancient tongue; he has no temple and no altar, yet holds fast to the peculiarities of the law; he has rejected the only possible Messiah, and yet abides as separate as though one were yet to come. His idea, once objective in its reality, has become the mere momentum of the past wearing itself slowly out; and yet it is the nearest thing to perpetual motion yet manifested.

In our own day, what has not France suffered from her idea of "glory!" Yet who is sure that she is cured, in spite of all her woes? Full of industries, economies, amazingly recuperative in material resources, she has remained in her corner of Europe gaining strength only to dissipate it for glory, crazy as a child to follow the drum, repudiating the statesman for the warrior.

The mantle of Rome has fallen upon England, while the philosophy of Greece speaks German. These new world powers adopt the old ruinous ideas just as Rome took her descent, in the ideal, from Troy, a city already fallen, and borrowed her gods, who could not keep house for her. It is the old idea under a modern form. Rome used force, and England employed trade. Rome had soldiers, and England her merchants. Rome conquered and plundered, and England sold, loaned, and foreclosed her mortgages. It comes to the same thing however in the end! There is such an extension as makes the span of business and credit too long, and then the break-down follows. We are yet to see what this thrust of the idea to make all the world pay tribute will end in. Perhaps England's greatest safety lies in the fact that many portions of the world are not minded to pay this tribute, and cannot be compelled to do so even by this great creditor of the world.

Russia for the Russians alone, and everything else for them that they can get, is an idea semi-barbaric but of mighty thrust. It matters not that there is a history of cause and effect of expulsion of Jew and Moor from Spain, of inquisition, and mas-

sacre of the Huguenot, Russia will nevertheless expel the Jew and persecute the Lutheran, and strike dumb every mouth that speaks not her own Russian language. What does history matter when one has an idea! But what of it when the idea becomes too weighty for the walls beneath? What of it for all Europe with her old Greek "balance of power" idea? When idea meets idea, then comes the tug of war!

But what of ourselves! It were strange indeed if we, as a nation, had no national ideas; and stranger yet if we had none that sit dangerously upon our lofty walls. True, we have hardly reached the roofing-in period: we are unfinished yet and our plans are still largely upon paper. Then too we change architects so often that our plans are modified and the walls torn down, for a story or two, to be put up in some other way. There is danger enough in this for the walls themselves that they may not stand; still, we may be pardoned for surmising as to the ideas that are ruling motives, despite all these changes, and pondering their thrust. It is our own land, and love and pride forecast the future even if they have but little certitude: if they cannot reason, they must imagine anyhow.

We have often been impressed by the conviction that one dominant Americanism is the idea that things must be upon a grand scale to be worth while, and that everything vast and gigantic is worthy. Our constant boast is that we have the biggest trees, waterfalls, rivers, the longest, the highest, the fastest, the sharpest, the superlative, in a word, of everything. Men go into business, prosper, expand, and expand until they fail. Railroads begin, but they never end! They are always adding, leasing, combining: they must stretch from ocean to ocean; and then, I suppose, must connect their termini by steamer service across these oceans. It bewilders one to understand where this vastness which we demand will lead us, and what is to happen when it is checked, as it must be somewhere and some time.

It is painfully easy to see that admiration of quantity is not nearly as elevated a quality as discrimination in quality. Savages are usually high feeders but indifferent as to the cooking.

It is not hard to find instances of our suffering already from this assumption that things must be large to be good. Whatever may be thought of the quality resultant, no one can successfully deny that this very idea of magnitude is at the root of educational methods in our day. You must have a *large* gathering of students, or your institution cannot amount to anything. That being settled as a *sine qua non*, it follows that you must have all sorts of "special courses" to catch every one that can be caught; and these courses must provide for any one who can read and write and walk alone;—and this the "university idea" as over against the old "regular college course."

You see this largeness over again in our hotels, our theatres, our public buildings. It seems as though we have been impressed with this one idea: we have grown wonderfully, we are growing wonderfully; and we must have everything large, exceeding large, or we shall outgrow it before it is outworn. How we suffered from that idea at the hands of our mothers when they prepared clothes for us in our growing boyhood! And to think that we are now inflicting it upon ourselves and one another!

But it means "manifest destiny!" Yes, we are destined to bring this entire continent, and all its insular appurtenances, hundreds of miles from us seaward, together into one grand republic, under a flag of so many stars that no room will be left on it for stripes,—and just as little remain of the thirteen originals, in life and spirit, that started it. Give us that idea, and we shall fulfill our destiny ourselves. We shall not wait for Providence to do any destiny work for us; we are our own destiny. And then what an unassimilated mass of citizens we shall be! It may be too much to expect of the goddess of Liberty to own all these races, colors, conditions, as her children and rule well in her own household. There is a limit to vastness in incongruities and human inability to manage successfully when the scale transcends certain dimensions.

Another of our dominant ideas is the worship of "cuteness," of intellect irrespective of morality or character. Whither will that lead us? Think of our "Napoleons of finance," our daring and brilliant brigands of the Jesse James order, our great politi-

cal partisans who can capture a city or a state, our dazzling divines who can find a text for any sermon that will draw a crowd. If it is successful, it is all a man's life is worth to get up and say it is wrong. "Nothing is so successful as success!" That is the motto of American multitudes. There must be snap, go, novelty, cuteness, risk, and success! Shall we some day pardon the man who adroitly and successfully proclaims the empire, because it was such a cute trick!

I hesitate to name materialism as an American idea, since it is cosmopolitan. When the abundant opportunity for making money, as in a new land, begins to slacken, I believe it will be found that we value intellectual and spiritual things just as much as any other nationality. We give now as liberally as we strive eagerly to get. If our social distinctions are based upon material possessions, that is just as sensible a way to mark them as by descent. In fact, if we entertain and are entertained, it is the most convenient way of establishing a "modus vivendi." I doubt, however, whether men are valued by the masses according to their wealth. Their value would be gauged by their influence. Do the richest men have the greatest influence? The question is not whether they can buy services, or votes; but whether they themselves have influence of themselves because they are rich.

We are in greatest danger, I fear, from the popular idea that we are a sort of divine favorite, that God has foreordained and elected us, irrespective of faith or works, to be the grandest and greatest and everlastingest republic, whose glories shall never fail, never pale, and whose dominion shall continue unto the end of time. Therefore, we have nothing to fear! No foe from without can conquer us, and no dissension can arise from within to disturb us. This idea was very popular before the Rebellion, which shook it sadly, and it is growing again since a generation has grown up for which those sad days are merely history, along with the Mexican war, and that of 1812. It lulls us all the while into false security, into governmental idiocy, into popular clap-trap and sentimentality. It is a dangerous idea indeed.

It is because of this fatalistic optimism that a certain class of

American politicians are contemptuous of the experiences of other lands, the lessons of history, and the admonitions of those who have studied the effects of public actions? We do certainly have such men who inflame their public by oratory whose only idea is that we can do as we please, are not limited by anything done anywhere else, should not do anything with consideration of the action of "the effete monarchies of Europe," and all such similar rot.

These are the men who soar into the seventh heaven of rhetoric over "our glorious institutions." We have, it is true, institutions in which we glory intelligently: we are devoutly thankful for them. But these soaring orators talk of them as though they were immutable and imperishable substances, while they are nothing more than patriotic and noble ideas inherited from our political ancestors, and dependent upon our reception, advocacy and impartation for their continuance. We, in a word, are our glorious institutions, we ourselves! If we degenerate, what becomes of them!

A republic takes bonds of itself, goes it own security, insures itself from revolution: nobody else does that. The virtue, intelligence, patriotism of its citizens is that security; and these are characteristics which must be inculcated, and learned in turn by each generation, or they perish. Under all these conditions our future is never assured: "the price of liberty is eternal vigilance." Until recently we have taken reckless risks by permitting our land to be a sort of dumping ground for Europe and Asia; and making it easier for any foreigner to have a vote and to become a citizen than to understand our institutions, read our constitution, and become naturalized in thought and in deed. And they have accepted our reckless prodigality to come: they have come, have seen; and the query is whether we have Americanized them or they have conquered us. We have still room and welcome for kindred spirits; but if we are to keep room for such, we must exclude those alienistic to republican institutions, incompatible in character with freedom: we must not attempt to absorb foreign population more rapidly than we can assimilate it.

But it is time to ask as to the remedy. There is little use in forewarning unless one can forearm. Can that be done, seeing that men will think, and will form ideals, and will be moved to action by them? It can, most certainly, be done if proper pains are taken to do it. Nations can be permeated with noble ideas whose basis is truth and fact, just as readily as they can be inflamed with visionary ideas or pride based upon suppositions unjustified by existing realities or efforts being made toward realization. This now should be the work of the patriotic in whatsoever sphere they may be found, the true campaign of education going on forever, and not the one-sided and specious one ending upon election day.

Those wonderful buildings which housed our recent Columbian Exhibition were a series of arches in which wall and roof were really continuous. That arched truss is the analogy of the proper roofing of a great and free nation! Its ideas are inductions from the facts and truths verified and established in its historic walls. It refuses to evolve out of its inner consciousness that which has never been in it; in other words, it refuses to "make believe" that it is the grandest and bravest and wisest and best, as so many nations have done, simply because it is so nice to be all those things. It examines itself carefully to see what it really is, what it lacks yet, how this may be supplied, and then sets to work to supply it. Its noblest idea is thus continuous with its lowest foundational fact.

Such a nation has indeed its aspirations, but it has also its perspirations, as the only way by which it expects to attain these heights of glory: it aims high, but it tackles low. It does not imagine that it knows everything intuitively because it is living in this enlightened nineteenth century—made such by the oil and wick and matches supplied by those centuries which went before—and in this glorious land of liberty. It goes modestly to work to find out what has been done, what can be done; and then what betterments it can make to add in its turn to the grand accumulation of the riches of civilization by which it has so greatly profited. Think of it! If our land could be swayed by this as its idea, if those who influence others could

and would thus animate them, what a wonderful land indeed we should become, how our arched roof would rise heavenward and our walls stand invincible.

It is largely the opportunity of the educator to accomplish somewhat of this thing, to leaven the lump and salt the meat. The teachers and companions of our childhood and youth give us our ideas: in manhood we reproduce them as our own, scarcely dreaming of their source. It is better for the teacher to instil sound ideas than correct grammar, better to make good citizens than fine mathematicians. Public schools, of whatever grade, are a public trust: they are endowed or permitted that men and women may come out of them fitted for the State, wholesome in it and not poisonous to it. Brawn and muscle may be good, brain and brightness are better; but a noble character for private and public life is the best product our educational institutions can offer us. When they cease to do that, they are worth but little to us!

Ill fares the land increased in all riches but without noble men and true women. It is the inviting prey for all those who raven upon national carcasses! We should be safer being poor and miserable and uninviting, if we will not insure our riches by our virtues. It is this question of character therefore that we must investigate most frequently. Are the rising men and women of our day, the young who will be the nation's manhood and womanhood to-morrow, honest, truthful, continent, as well as intelligent and vigorous in body? If not, who educated them, and how?

We never despair of the republic! We simply go on doing our duty as fully and as well as we can! He who dominates his life with that idea has roofed it over securely: there is no vicious thrust in that. Men may despond or be sanguine by temperament and nature: they ought to be just as persistent by character when they expect defeat as when they are sure of victory. Thou canst not tell which will prosper! The battle is never lost nor won until it is ended. Never despair of the republic, if by that is meant to cease from effort and sit down listlessly in bitter idleness. The true man persists, knowing that

he cannot do too much, and may readily do too little. Let others prophesy good or evil as they please: as for us and ours, let us do to-day's duty and ask not of the morrow. Thus shall we best insure fair days to come.

---

## ARTICLE V.

## THE CHURCH: VISIBLE AND INVISIBLE.

By REV. J. C. F. RUPP, A. M., McKeesport, Pa.

The Church is limited by two tendencies of contradictory meaning. One emphasizes the term *visible*, and finds the Church in every essential existing in its visible form, while the other lays greater stress upon its *invisible* character and finds the Church in every essential existing only in its invisible form. These are similar to two philosophical tendencies: *materialism* on the one hand, cannot separate the idea from physical form, while, on the other, *spiritualism* cannot bring these two things together. The one influence sees the Church only in its external form, the other only in its internal character. The relation of the invisibility and visibility of the Church may be illustrated by the relation of soul and body. Can the soul exist separate and apart from the body? Are they in their respective operations independent of each other; or are they mutually interdependent one on the other? Is their separate action ever a healthy one? There may arise from the condition of the body a morbid mental or soul condition. Dreaming is not a normal or healthy manifestation of this dual existence. In this and doubtless every other abnormal condition the fault comes from the diseased body, which is often a barrier to vigorous thought.

Does the church invisible have separate existence from the church visible?

A Roman Catholic will certainly say No; for everything there exists in a visible sensual nature. This is necessarily so because of their conception of the sacramental character of the

Church and of the *ex opere operato* or absolute efficiency of the sacraments.

On the other hand, a Reformed, as over against a Lutheran, Christian would almost as certainly answer Yes; because of the idealistic, spiritualizing tendency of his exegesis and theology. Finding in human reason a source of religious knowledge co-ordinate with the word, he uses it in his exegesis to the elimination of all that is illogical or incomprehensible. A no less powerful influence is found in the disposition of the Reformed churches to antagonize whatever is Romish in theory or practice, *ex sui genere*.

However, being a Lutheran Christian, I cannot hold any position out of harmony with the consensus of the Bible. I, therefore, occupy a conservative medium between these two extremes touching the character and relation of the invisible to the visible Church. Two propositions formulate my convictions concerning this question:

- I. The Church in its organization is *visible*.
- II. The Church in its essence is *invisible*.

Can the organization exist separate and apart from its vital essence; or its essence have separate existence from the body? "The creed," says Luther, "calls the Holy Christian Church the communion or fellowship of the saints. I believe that there exists a holy little body and communion upon earth of none but saints called together by the Holy Spirit under *one head*, Christ, in one faith, sense and understanding, endowed with manifold gifts, yet unanimous in love, concordant in all things, without sect and schism. Of this same Church I am also a part and a member, participant and associate of all the blessings which it has brought to it by the Holy Ghost, and incorporate with it, in that I have heard and yet have God's word, which is the beginning of the entrance into this communion."

This Church is in its essence primarily *invisible* inasmuch as it involves an article of faith. Luther continues: "Is this article true, I believe in the Holy Christian Church? Then it follows that no one can *see* or *feel* the Holy Christian Church;

consequently no one can say, Lo, here it is; or, There it is; for what we *believe* is not an object of sight, or sense-perception: and again what a man sees or perceives, that he does not believe."

But this Church can be recognized by its visible tokens, the word and sacraments. For "God's word," Luther says, "cannot be without God's people, nor God's people without God's word." "This is consequently the essential visibility of the Church; that is to say, though the essence of the Church be not visible, and the Church is not visible according to its essence, it is visible according to its outward tokens; as to the essential nature of man his spirit is invisible yet it has its tokens in the living visible body, by which we know where it is and what it is doing." (Krauth.)

"The *invisible* Church is the whole assembly of true saints and believers, and this is the Church properly and truly so called. The *visible* Church is the assembly of the called, but this is a Church only in the wide sense and not in the proper sense. It can be called Church only by synecdoche; that is to say, it is attributed to the whole made up of good and bad, which strictly belongs only to a part."

"If you have regard to the outward society of signs and rites of the Church, the Church militant is said to be visible and embraces all those who are found in the assembly of the called, whether they be pious or godless, elect or reprobate. If, however, you consider the Chnrch, as it is, a society of faith and of the Holy Ghost who dwells in the hearts of the faithful, or as Bauer adds, 'who are conjoined with Christ, the head, through faith, and as living members constitute one mystic body with him,' it is called the invisible Church and proper Church of the elect." (Hutter.)

These are not two Churches, but only two sides of the same Church. It is one thing in two respects. The true visible Church is one with the true invisible Church. Strictly speaking it is one and the same Church considered in the one case externally and in the other internally. Considered in its external organization it is a divine institution, and in its external constitution it is human. Like the two natures in the one person of

Christ, which are inseparable, it is one institution with both internal and external characteristics, one pertaining to its *essence* the other to its *marks* or signs.

The tendencies, referred to at first, develop in one direction high Church views, in the other broad Church views. The climax is attained in the Roman Catholic notion of the Church. "This is the externalizing tendency completely developed, where the Church in visible form identifies itself with the essential Church and regards its own organization with the pope at its head as the bearer and organ of the Holy Ghost and still acting in his inspiration and consequently involving membership with itself as a necessary condition of salvation of every individual, the legal membership rather than the spiritual."

The latitudinarian view recognizes in the congregation only the circumstances pertaining to the world, and in the Church invisible all that is necessary. Its ripest fruit is seen, no doubt, in the Society of Friends or Quakers.

This tendency is responsible for the many independent congregations responsible only to themselves. In the same way many individuals delude themselves with the false hope that they are in the invisible Church, while at the same time they repudiate any connection with the visible Church, because of sin in its members who are not perhaps in the invisible Church. Without the means of grace, but by their good character and the moral excellence of their life and works they claim to be in the invisible Church.

The congregation is the *visible* Church, but "the word is preached and the sacraments administered not in the name of the congregation, but of the Church. Pastors over the congregations are ministers, not properly of the congregation, but of the Church, since their office rests upon a divine call and appointment and is occupied with the administration of a divine institution. Limiting our conception of the congregation entirely to those who are the true children of God, that is, to the invisible Church, the distinction still remains; the Church is still a divine institution, placed over the children of God, determined in some of the features of its precise form by the will

of the congregation, but in everything essential guiding and training and governing the congregation. It is God's house furnished with the means of grace and full authority for applying God's remedy for sin. It is the Church that is the possessor of God's revelation in Holy Scripture, that is endowed with the miraculous efficacy of the Holy Sacraments. It is the Church that has the divine authority to preach and teach the Gospel, to baptize, and to administer the Holy Supper and to exercise the power of the keys. It is the Church that has the historical confessions of faith, that has developed forms of constitutions and modes of external regulation. The Church is always above the congregation : that is, what God has established, the divine institution, has binding authority over the entire congregation. The congregation is not the founder of the Church's institutions, as the preaching of the gospel, the administration of the sacraments, and the office of the ministry. These are not exercised in the name and by the authority of the congregation. It is not at liberty to determine the administration of the sacraments, but only to comply with the command the Lord has given the Church."

Nevertheless the Church and congregation are inseparable, however carefully they must be distinguished. Where two or three believers are, there is the Church in all its plenitude of grace and power. The one, Holy Christian Church, as an institution existing through many lands and ages, is present in all the fulness of its power and blessing in every congregation of believers. A Christian congregation cannot exist except as a Church, and a Church cannot exist outside of a congregation of believers. They cannot be separated in fact, yet the distinction must be well observed in order that the limitations of the obligation and freedom of the congregation be not transcended. For it may be that not every act of the congregation is an act of the Church, but only such as are performed by God's command and in accordance with his word. The Church prescribes the standard of the word to which the congregation must conform, else it ceases to be a believing congregation and the authority of the Church is absent. The congregation has no

power at its own pleasure to decide matters of doctrine and practice ; all this power must be exercised within the limitations defined by the Church, the divine institution, and prescribed to the Church by its Lord and Master. Hence the Church visible, or congregation apart from the Church invisible or the Church, is like the branch severed from the vine ; and neither can exist in the world in the exercise of its especial functions without the sympathy and coöperation of the other ; as a man cannot accomplish his mission in the unity of effort without the coöperation of every faculty and power of body and soul. The Church invisible and visible are as inseparable as body and soul.

---

## ARTICLE VI.

### CHRISTIAN EDUCATION.

By REV. PROF. F. P. MANHART, A. M., Selinsgrove, Pa.

A discussion of education from a denominational standpoint within the limits of a synodical\* address must necessarily be meagre and partial. And although there have been many and elaborate discussions and treatises, yet within our General Synod to-day, further discussion must have at least the one prime merit of timeliness.

The well-known legend on the seal of the oldest American college and an important passage of Paul may serve as mottoes. The former is, *Pro Christo et Ecclesia*. The latter is, Eph. 4:4—There is one body and one Spirit—one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God and Father of all, who is over all, and through all and in all. But unto each of us was the grace given according to the measure of the gift of Christ. And *He* gave some to be apostles ; and some prophets ; and some evangelists ; and some pastors and teachers ; for the perfecting of the saints unto the work of ministering ; unto the building up of the body of Christ.

Of these gifts of Christ to his Church, the Apostolic Order

---

\*Delivered before the East Pennsylvania Synod.

ceased with the death of John. The functions and work, in the main, Biblical sense, of the others are combined in the persons and services of the Christian ministers of our times.

The ministry abides in the Church on earth as a perpetual dower of Christ to his bride. He being king, they are his ambassadors. He being Truth and Wisdom, Redemption and Love, they are stewards of his mysteries. He being the Shepherd and Bishop of souls, they are his under-shepherds.

Their first requisite is *character*. In doing the Lord's work, like their Saviour and Master, they must have clean hands and pure hearts. A second requisite is *knowledge*. God's promise to His people is : I will bring you to Zion ; and I will give you shepherds according to mine heart who shall feed you with knowledge and understanding. (Jer. 3 : 14, 15). This is fulfilled in ministers who are disciplined into spiritual understanding and power. They only can so use Christian truth, as "to make bad men good and good men better" and thus fulfill their divine calling.

The Church must not commit the office and work of her ministry to novices. (1 Tim. 3 : 6). She must see that adequate preparation and testing be undergone.

This preparation and this testing must necessarily be such as harmonize with the spheres in which men will exercise their ministry ; since the unity of the Church is not now in things visible. So as a Christian denomination has its providential sphere and mission, it has also its ideals of the culture necessary to best growth in grace, and to adequate preparation for its ministry.

The Lutheran Church strives to realize the true ideals of Christian culture by beginning with her children in infancy and ending only as they are translated into Paradise. These ideals demand for their realization, the home, Sunday-school, catechetical class, church worship and all other spiritual life. Before entrance to her ministry they ordinarily, also, call for the work of the Christian academy, college and seminary. In all and throughout all, her ideals and means of Christian culture, are essentially the same.

Christian baptism is the foundation, divinely given the Church, of all Christian culture. It is the sacrament of regeneration, of dedication, and of incorporation into the Christian Church. Says Farrar: "Respecting regeneration and baptism St. Paul is mystic and dogmatic, while St. Peter is moral and general. With St. Paul regeneration is a new creation, the beginning of a life which is not the human and individual life, but which is 'Christ in us.' With St. Peter the new birth is produced by the living and abiding *word* of God. With St. Paul, baptism is the beginning of the new birth and the communication of the spirit. With St. Peter, baptism is mainly the moral obligations which enter into it as the type of our deliverance by means of the resurrection of Christ." (*Early Days of Christianity*, 76). Lutheranism happily presents the blended, full truth of the revelation given through these two great apostles.

Says Luther: "They which are baptized are regenerated and renewed by the Holy Ghost, to a heavenly righteousness and to eternal life, there riseth in them also a new light and a new flame; there rise in them new and holy affections, as the fear of God, true faith and assured hope etc.; there beginneth in them also a new will. And this is to put on Christ truly, and according to the Gospel." (On the passage: As many of you as were baptized into Christ have put on Christ. Gal. 3: 27.)

With the "mystic and dogmatic" Paul, we believe in the new creation; with the "practical" Peter, we believe in the "moral obligations" that flow therefrom; and in harmony with Paul and Peter and Luther we make the significance of baptism to be the foundation of Christian nurture, the life-long daily destroying of the Old Adam and the daily coming and rising of the New Man.

On the one foundation—the abiding word of God—spoken by the Christ of God; and the inherent power of the sacrament, the Lutheran Church aims to build up her children into houses of gold, silver and precious stones—living temples wherein the spirit of the living God shall dwell forever. This Christian culture is begun by parents. The command under the law was:

Hear, O, Israel; the Lord our God, is one Lord; and thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might. And these words, which I command thee, this day, shall be upon thine heart; and thou shalt teach them diligently to thy children, and thou shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up. And thou shalt bind them for a sign upon thine hand, and they shall be for frontlets between thine eyes. And thou shalt write them upon the door posts of thine house and upon thy gates. (Deut. 6).

Christian parents are required to nurture their children in the chastening and admonition of the Lord. (Eph. 6 : 4). Their chief model is the home in Nazareth, where in subjection to his parents "the boy Jesus" was so nurtured that he "advanced in wisdom and stature and in grace with God and men." (Luke 2 : 43, 51, 52).

Pastors are charged to feed both the lambs and the sheep of Christ's flock. And surely, in the fold of that Good Shepherd, who takes the little ones in his arms and blesses them, the young must receive the special care of the under-shepherds.

In his work of direct teaching the pastor has an efficient co-worker in the Sunday-school, whose true aim is Christian nurture by means of the study and teaching of the word of God. A Sunday-school should ordinarily be the Church engaged in Bible study.

Besides, there is the vast amount of work to be done in the Church by her special "teachers."

Important as the nurture of parent, pastor and teacher may be, it is not more so than self-culture. In the means of Christian culture, used or neglected by each for himself, is found the chief element in the direct making of enduring character. As soon as he is no longer entirely dependent, the developing Christian youth should begin a work of self-culture in grace, that will broaden and deepen with the strengthening of his intellectual and spiritual powers. The milk that nourished him in infancy must give way to the meat that will build him up into the stature of

a full man in Christ Jesus. With the image of Christ developed and developing within him, he attains such stability and power that there continuously flow from him streams of living waters, that aid men and glorify God.

Of course, all this is only saying, that in all true education the Holy Spirit is the teacher. He works through the word and sacraments, as means. He is in, and with the word, making it spirit and life, and therefore an ever-abiding thing of power. The word and the elements make the sacraments. The word, by the spirit in it, gives them the power to seal and convey the blessings of grace they signify.

The general educational work of a Christian denomination is beyond that of the local church, yet it is closely related to all congregational and personal life and progress.

A Church wisely founds and maintains the Christian school. She thus only meets her obligations to her children and herself. She owes them the highest culture in her power. In imparting it to them, she not only blesses them, but preserves them for herself and secures her own strength and perpetuity by their increased devotion and power. Church schools are a necessity to any denomination which realizes that under God it has a distinctive life and mission.

In them only can a Church freely endeavor to realize her ideals. Here it may subordinate all that is merely intellectual, all that is secular, to her higher spiritual ideas and aims.

Where schools are founded by her efforts, endowed with her means, consecrated by her prayers, and are the trusted recipients of her children, there rightfully her life and spirit are fostered and developed.

From the early days of the Reformation, the Lutheran Church has always believed in, and had, such schools.

Our early Fathers in America earnestly desired them. Our Fathers of a later date began the work of founding them. As our Church in America is only in its beginnings, the work of founding and strengthening them must continue indefinitely. This simply means, that the youth of our Church, without los-

ing any historic family trait, and conscious of a great heritage and an equally great mission, will be nurtured into a Christian strength, worthy of our Church's noble heritage and equal to the demands of her sublime mission.

The Church school, as well as others, may appropriate all that affords true mental discipline; but she uses such things for simply what they are, while she judges them according to her pure and lofty standards. Thus she knows the value of the study of the classics for purposes of mental discipline and culture. She knows, too, that studious contact with the literatures of Greece and Rome means intimate knowledge of their mythologies, life and morals. The blending of Greece and Rome produced a "civilization," the consummate product and fitting sovereign of which was Nero, whom to describe, to Gibbon's "terrific phrase"—"a priest, an atheist and a god,"—must be added, "an arch-devil,"—or perhaps Luther's untranslatable description of the papacy—an über-höllische-höllische Teufel. The The antiseptic of Christian ethics and life is greatly needed where the atmosphere is surcharged with putrefaction.

The Church school teaches science. This is a "scientific age." The "scientific spirit" so called, asserts itself in theological as well as in all other lines of intellectual work. It is taught because the man of liberal education must come in daily contact with the spirit, results and claims of all that is called science. But the Church school teaches no science in an atheistic, agnostic or materialistic spirit. For her all true science is but the finding and setting forth of God's thoughts as written in his books of nature and revelation. Moral law is his will revealed in man and the Bible. Material law is an ordinary mode of his activity. All force originates in spirit, and God is the Spirit. In short, God as Father, Son or Holy Ghost, is the direct source of all life, all force, all order, all beauty, all being,—material, mental, and spiritual.

The Church school teachers history, since it is "philosophy teaching by example." She does not teach with Carlyle that all worthy history is simply heroic personality, and that the heroic is simply the strong. To her the real forces of history are the

spiritual. Its real heroes are the lovers of truth, of God and of men. Its great lesson is—God reigns. The testimony of Jesus is the burden of the divine history. The life of Jesus is the summit of all earthly history. The ages preceding were preparing for it. The eras following but mark man's efforts, conscious or unconscious, to know him and to receive him as Saviour and Lord. Thus history's chief significance is the portrayal of the kingdom of God in the earth. "Through the ages one increasing purpose runs." That purpose is divine. It is the fuller coming of Christ to man. It is

"The one divine event  
Toward which the whole creation moves."

A similar spirit controls throughout the entire curriculum and tones up the whole atmosphere. In all intellectual life, the Nazarene is king. Lifting him up, all things are put under him, The Church school is therefore preëminently the place for the strengthening of Christian character. Its numbers may not be large, but, like the Rugby of Arnold, it will be made up of Christian gentlemen. Should it fail perchance to excel in the kind of athletics, whose chief elements are physical agility, strength and brutality, the comparative absence of rowdyism, cheating, drinking and licentiousness, will, in the minds of certain old time people at least, prove a fair compensation. Here there can be no little failure to instill manly virtues and develop Christian graces of character.

Right results in character are never secured at the expense of intellect. The fact is, the purer the character the stronger the intellect. It is as true in education as in religion, that to him who seeks first the kingdom of God and his righteousness, all else is added. The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom.

Christ is the truth—the source, centre, and end of truth in every sphere of thought, life and being. To turn to him with the heart, is to have the greatest possible intellectual awakening. To live in him, is to have the highest intellectual power. To make him the centre, is to bring all else into right relations. His truth radiates to all and is the truth of all.

There is no education like that based upon these ideas of Christ and relations to him.

In the science of the human mind it places the spirit at the summit. In regeneration the Spirit of Christ touches the spirit of man into life and exalted activity, and therefore awakens to greatest activity and power all the lower faculties like the reason and understanding, as auxiliaries of the spirit.

Under it all philosophies of human life, of nature, and of being, are illuminated by him who is the light of the world.

All problems of sociology must find their final solution in him; since all relations of man to man are adjudged by the relation of every man to him—the Son of man. All ideals and ideas of ethics are determined as proven to be in harmony or in dissonance with his teaching, life or person.

All reforms must be accomplished by making individuals new creatures in him, and then extending the regeneration to communities and nations.

And similarly in all intellectual and religious life, Christ will reign because his right to reign is unquestioned.

In the Lutheran system of belief, and in the Lutheran ideal of life, the doctrine of Christ is the fundamental of fundamentals. The doctrines of justification, the sacraments, etc., are simply parts of this. It is especially demanded, therefore, that in Lutheran schools the Christ-spirit should dominate. Religious life in Lutheran schools should be essentially like that in her homes and her churches. Her hymns, her music, her catechism and her service and all that is historically distinctive in her spiritual life should be found here. Here, her spirit must be unshackled. Here, libraries should give the place of honor to works of her scholars and the records of the lives and services of her worthy children. Here, walls should be covered with the memorials of her heroes. On public occasions things that conserve the continuity of her historic life and spirit should never be absent.

(Harvard in her great quarto-Millennial Jubilee sang our majestic Ein Feste Burg, the world's greatest hymn, while a few years since our Book of Worship did not contain it.)

The American Lutheran college, which has the largest attend-

ance, makes the rendering of historic Lutheran hymns and music by trained singers, choruses and bands, selected and formed from its own students, a feature of commencements and other public occasions. In consequence, a special building to accommodate several thousands of visitors is required. The contrast between the life and spirit thus represented, and that which on similar occasions hires an orchestra to render the same music it does for "society" balls and banquets, is certainly marked and suggestive.

Would it not be curious and suggestive, if in any Lutheran schools the language of Luther should be so studied, from merely literary authors, that at the end of all the precious years given its study very few ministers are able to read its treasures in theological literature, and very many are unable to offer even a simple prayer for the consolation of a pious and lonely German of our faith?

Should Luther's Bible, the hymns, prayer books, liturgies or any other of the multitude of German devotional works, be faithfully studied for six months, an excellent foundation of practical knowledge for the pastor might be obtained, while withal an earnest and devout piety would be fostered. No plea is made that anything which ministers to true culture should be ignored or that anything which produces sectarian bigotry should be fostered. To know the great range of intellectual and spiritual life in so vast a thing as Lutheranism, is to touch other forms of Christian life sympathetically at so many points as to make bigotry well nigh impossible.

Let it be remembered in this connection, that the Lutheran idea of Christian life and piety is well adapted to cultured youth. It calls for the earnest and devout, yet withal, the assured, the warm, free and joyous. It calls for loyalty to truth, but not for Puritanical rigor; it calls for heartiness, but not for emotional fanaticism. In E. A. Pollard's life of Florence Nightengale, it is said of her while receiving her training as a nurse under pastor Fliedner at Kaiserwerth: "At once she recognized that she had found what she had so long sought, a spirit of devotion, of order and of unity of purpose. It was impossible not to be impressed with the air of purity, and the deep, un-

affected piety which pervaded the whole place; and yet there was no asceticism—it was the world, but not in the ordinary sense of the word. There were the young [Lutheran] deaconesses with their intelligent and animated countenances, no mere instruments yielding a blind and passive obedience, but voluntary and enlightened agents, obeying, on conviction, an inward principle."

Contrast this spirit and life with those of the average general hospital of that time and some of our own time, and the difference is seen to be "exceeding great." Yet this difference is no greater than that which marks the contrast between schools where the Lutheran ideas of culture, piety and life prevail and those where their opposites prevail.

The Lutheran Church must have a continuous supply of ministers; adequate in numbers, ability and spirit, to the work given her by Providence. Her old fields must be retained, enlarged and improved. Her Diaspora, numbering millions and scattered over the earth, must have pastors and churches. Her missions must be sustained, and increased in number and efficiency, for she must bear her full share in evangelizing the world.

Her faithfulness, in these times, to the biblical doctrines of sin and grace, makes heavy demands upon her ministry. Human nature is as sinful and needy as ever. Divine truth and grace are, as ever, the only cure. To bring the healing to diseased humanity requires many faithful pastors.

These must keep abreast of life's rapidly changing currents in our day. Many of these forces are unfavorable to Christianity. It is required, therefore, of our ministers that they be men of right culture. Their outlook must be wide. Their views of life must be true. Their sympathy with men must be deep and real.

There are things which the practical judgment of the Church affirms to be essential in all her ministers. They are such as sincere piety, sound judgment, a fair knowledge of human nature, practical power as preachers of the word, faithfulness as pastors, and such a measure of the spirit of Christ as will lead them to labor where there are souls to be saved—whether in fertile or waste fields, at home or at the world's rims.

The same practical judgment of the Church declares that other things are desirable in all ministers, and, for the Church's best welfare, necessarily found in many. They are such as:

1. Ability to command respect by extensive attainments.
2. The power resulting from disciplinary studies, and a wide range of literary and other culture.
3. A scholar's acquaintance with Bible facts and biblical theology.
4. Ability to employ and enjoy the range of studies auxiliary to a scientific knowledge of the Bible and the special fields of theological science.
5. A philosophic understanding of sacred, church and general history, as portrayals of the progressive revelation of truth, and the development of the kingdom of God in the world.
6. Ability to meet, as a full-armed Christian apologist, all current phases of infidelity and opposition to the Church.
7. Ability to exercise, as a Christian theologian, the functions of research, teaching and publication.

Our Church needs many more efficient ministers. To secure them, parents, pastors and teachers must coöperate in urging the claims of the Church for her ministry upon all who may be fitted for it.

Our Missouri brethren now have about one-fifth more ministers than the General Synod, but, specially aided by their parochial schools, their church spirit and their wonderful practical wisdom, they have about three times as many theological students. Their successful experience here, as well as in other spheres, is worthy of our earnest consideration. As an aid to the increase of the ministry the beneficiary system has long been used by our Church. It does not aim to support students, but simply to afford them necessary supplementary aid. Beneficiary funds are cheerfully given because of the warm place the Christian ministry holds in the hearts of Christian people.

The reception of aid from such sacred funds imposes such duties as economy, honorable conduct, faithfulness and consecration. It follows, as a matter of course, that beneficiaries never indulge in such luxuries as tobacco, expensive trips during

term time, et id omne genus, so well known to the secular life of modern schools. They never cheat for honors, and are never found among those whom Noah Porter describes as "the pygmies who ride ponies."

They do, however, practice Christian self-denial, and daily exhibit high Christian honor. They do faithfully and honestly whatever the wisdom of the Church assigns to them during their period of preparation. May the tribe of such increase! May many more Christian homes loyally and gratefully consecrate their sons to the work, the trials, and the joys of the Christian ministry. Luther appealed in behalf of the Christian school for the preservation and extension of the Gospel. The need now is scarcely less urgent than it was then. The wisdom of it, the 370 years since then have made manifest.

That Christian nurture, which furnishes the Church its best workmen, extends through nursery, primary, intermediate, grammar, high-school, academy, college, seminary and all active life. Luther and the Lutheran Church know no difference in the essential character—in the spirit and means—of this culture through all these grades of intellectual development. The catechism he prepared for the use of humble parents in the home, was his own daily study in advanced life.

The Lutheran Church has lost a large part of its natural heritage in the United States. Much of that loss was a righteous judgment upon the folly of placing a language above the faith, and of servilely imitating others, instead of using and developing her own treasures, in faith and worship.

The Lutheran Church in America will be, and do, what she ought, when without apology, and with an assured consciousness of a great mission, she fully secures and cultivates the field that is hers, by assignment of Providence. In the doing of that work nothing will be a more important factor than a ministry whose training throughout has been in harmony with her teachings, spirit and life.

And upon the work of securing such a ministry, to labor amid our free institutions—which are the outcome of the principles and work of our heroic founder—may we all reverently invoke the blessing of Almighty God.

## ARTICLE VII.

### LUTHERANISM IN AMERICAN LIBERTY VINDICATED.

By REV. LEE M. HEILMAN, D. D., Chicago, Ill.

James Freeman Clarke accredits Luther as "the real author of modern thought and action—the giant founder of modern civilization," and many historians, esteemed as models in scientific acumen and correctness, have given the same judgment. But the venerable Church bearing the name of the Reformer has been set forth by some authors in a very unwarrantable light, by holding it up as having elements in itself which are subversive of the principles and institutions of true "republics." It is only proper that adherents of this Church, whose fathers settled on this soil but a year or two later than the Pilgrims of New England, and who have shared the toils and conflicts of patriotic citizenship, millions of whom have piously revered, richly enjoyed, and peacefully fallen asleep in the truth as taught by their denomination, should be defended against misrepresentations.

Their descendants should not be required to rest under the implication that the old tenets are inimical to the land they live in and love. Discussion which may seem discordant, in these days of cherished feelings of fraternity, might be desisted from, did not the large accessions to the Lutheran Church by immigration constantly revive the question of the evangelical and civil tendencies of Lutheranism. Even these facts might be passed by did not the stereotyped statements concerning this Church appear in ever new editions of "histories," in unverified "manuals" and in popular periodicals, by which millions of Lutheran citizens are compelled to have thrust upon them, in libraries, in various associations, and even in the public schools, teachings which are offensive to them and even false.

It is still asserted as if it were true and had never been denied, that the Lutheran Church is "half Catholic" and is a "state

church;" and in doctrinal views and practices is ranked as totally heterogeneous, foreign, exotic and unsuited to promote the liberty of America. The statement of Bancroft, that "the direct influence of Lutheranism on America was inconsiderable," might be suffered as an opinion, did not the same talented author, in his celebrated history of America, seek persistently to discriminate against Lutheranism and to argue that only Calvinism and Puritanism contained the elements of "purity of religion and civil liberty." Calvin is called the "boldest of reformers," while Luther is pictured as seeking the corrupt "protection of princes." The Genevan and Independent systems of teaching and practice are exalted as the only agencies of "republicanism." When this author does speak of favorable influences of the Reformation, it is with the interpretation that "Luther finished his mission in the heart of Germany," and only Calvin "continued the career of enfranchisement." The opinion is popularized that the Lutheran Reformation "belonged to Germany," and that only that of the Swiss and French was universal. Lutheranism is defined as the Catholic side of the Reformation movement, with "Romish dogmas and forms."

Mr. Bancroft in writing his work has shown himself a master of philosophical literary composition; and yet in this very strength lies his weakness. When in his philosophic history he sought for the principles whence sprang the events and institutions he meant to describe, he did it amidst influences which were almost necessarily controlling. While, as a student, he sat at the feet of such rationalists as Fichte and Hegel teaching the philosophy of history, he certainly became ill fitted through them to discern the virtues of theological tendencies, and especially tendencies of Lutheran theology. And as, at that time, the system of government in Germany furnished him no demonstration of real Lutheranism in civil affairs, just so did he fail to get to the source of Lutheran thought when he pursued his studies under Schlosser at the University of Heidelberg. Indeed his journey on foot through Switzerland, the home of Calvinism, must have been congenial to his feelings which in early life were cherished under the Calvinistic Puritanism of his father, the eminent Dr. Aaron Bancroft. Theology, too, was a prominent

study with him, but the trend of it was determined by the nature of the pulpit from which he for a time discoursed. From all such surroundings it is easily discerned how he had not informed himself upon Lutheran teachings from Lutheran sources thoroughly enough to speak in such a positive tone in his philosophic narrative. One cannot fancy how an impartial historian of events could otherwise feel himself called upon so frequently to turn aside from his story to assail Luther and his teachings in such unguarded and merciless criticisms.

The defense of what is regarded as revered truth will not seem uncharitable, since the Calvinism and Puritanism of the present do not embrace the extreme views of the old Genevan and Independent systems which Bancroft labors to exhibit as the germ of modern liberty of thought. No intelligent or charitable mind can fail to accord to the heroic Puritan souls of old and New England many virtues; but who that is impartial in intelligence and charity can fail to rebuke the narrowness which refuses Lutheranism its true share of recognition among the factors of our civil achievements?

To meet the real subject, in definite detail, leads us into the mysteries of doctrines which the historian searched in pursuing the plan of his learned work.

Bancroft conceived Lutheranism to be just as Romanizing as the church of England was under Cranmer and Elizabeth, when Puritanism arose. He did not look far enough to see that the Romish dogmas of the Episcopacy and the Apostolic Succession, with the many attendant ceremonies, were rejected by the Lutheran Church with every vestige of the Catholic priesthood and power.

This writer thus persists in showing the Reformer's supposed Romish and liberty-destroying principles. "Luther," he says, "hesitated to deny the real presence," and "favored magnificence in the ceremonies of worship," and concludes that "Luther's was a Catholic religion." To indicate his conception of Luther's relation to civil and religious liberty he affirms that the Reformer "acknowledged the protection of princes." According to Bancroft, Luther "resisted the Roman Church for its immor-

ability;" he opposed the *folly* of superstition, and *ridiculed* the hair shirt and the scourge, the purchased indulgence and the dearly bought masses for the dead," and "permitted the cross and the taper, pictures and images, as things of indifference."

These allegations are chains forged in skillful rhetoric to hold Luther to the crude doctrines of the Romish Church, not freed from her dead superstitious forms of worship, and still adhering to her methods of temporalizing the spiritual kingdom of Christ for the advantages of the civil power. This made the personal rights of individuals as much as ever subject to the imposition of numerous sacramental delusions, to the pomp of ceremony, and to a government itself ruled by an oppressive priesthood. The Reformer is characterized as opposing Rome "for its immorality," as if he had failed to strike the source of all corruption in Romish perversion of the simple teachings of Scripture. When Luther is described as lifting his thunder tones about the monk's shirt and scourge, indulgence and masses, he is said to merely "ridicule," as though he apprehended no serious wrongs in practices that robbed the soul of the sweetness and liberty of simple faith.

The Reformer who has been historically deemed as of "considerable influence" in the stirring events of the sixteenth century and of the world, is thus suddenly made to appear as a "wit", playing his sportive art on Catholic images and masses, and amusing himself with the "folly" of various superstitions, as if he neither understood Rome's blasphemous idolatry nor felt indignation against it. What, ask we then, did Luther do? Verily the "monk that shook the world" was not in Erfurt nor in Wittenberg! The Bible must have been found at Orleans by young Calvinus and opened first at Geneva! This new discovery of our "American historian," changes the programme of events for the last four centuries, and puts "Calvin of Bruges," or Paris, on as the actor "with sterner dialectics" who really was the first one that "attacked the Roman doctrines." He it is that discerns the mass as an idolatrous sacrifice; and, opening the eyes of the populace to the hidden corruptions and superstition, he liberates the human mind, and becomes "the

guide of Swiss republics," and henceforth founder of all republics. This movement is said to have entered England, where it effected that Puritanism which finally only in America evolved the doctrine of the right of private judgment! By this latest result, says the historian, "Puritanism admitted no voucher but the Bible, a fixed rule which Puritanism allowed neither parliament nor hierarchy nor king to interpret."

We have no quarrel with Calvinism or Independency about the claim of having had these views, but who that is impartial can allow them the claim of first having reached them, and so deprive Lutheranism of everything that gave it existence, and make the Reformation of twenty years before Calvin a literal farce?

Luther's a "Catholic religion?" What is Catholicism? It consists of the infallibility and supremacy of the pope, and, as a consequence, in taking from the laity the word of God and denying them the right of reading and judging for themselves by that word alone. This arrogant power subjected the masses of the people to unintelligible works and ceremonies, which deprived the soul of the comforting doctrine of free grace, filled the mind with gloomy fear, suppressed self-improvement, and robbed all for the support of the hierarchy.

Who needs now to be told that Luther did not parley with this monster robbery of human rights? If ever man, with clear apprehension of the situation and of serious sense of duty to the hour, stood face to face with the real source of human bondage, he did; and his resistance sprang not from witticisms. The echo of the effective blows he gave resounded within a fortnight, even then, throughout Europe. The revolution stirred millions, and the "little monk" followed up the result with no cajoling of popes or crouching to councils. The pope's bull against him was defiantly burned, doctrines of masses and superstitious works, founded by the papacy, were treated not only from sincere soul convictions and by manly strength, but without fear of any human power. The Bible without pope or priest was, before Calvin or Browne, preëminently Luther's authority. He set up there once and for all time the inalienable "right of pri-

vate judgment." He who does not appreciate this needs to read history again. Let him go to Leipsic and to Augsburg; let him hear the memorable words at Worms, before hierarchy itself and before earth's notable princes, "Unless I am convinced by evidence of Holy Scripture, or by sound clear argument, I will not retract." Then let him see how Luther, on being threatened by the papal legate, summoned the rights of the individual man and solemnly declared in the face of the world, "Here I stand, I cannot do otherwise: God help me." That was the final blow that wrested liberty from mediæval times. Carlyle says, "It is the great point from which the whole subsequent history of civilization takes its rise." The Reformation so begun, Froude declares, "gave Europe its new life." "Luther," says Michelet, "has been the restorer of liberty in modern times." He gave Romanism blows from which it has never recovered. Whatever other principles men have since elaborated they did under the protection Luther secured, when he stood for individual rights as against papal authority, and "hesitated" about nothing that to him was the truth.

It was here, then, that he, before Puritanism, "admitted no voucher but the Bible." It was the final authority to his conscience. He affirms, that "since God has given me grace to understand Paul I have not been able to understand any doctors." He criticises them for not having understood the Hebrew text, and rises so far above "the words and works of the fathers" that he can say that from them "articles of faith are not made." His greater testimony, however, to the place he assigns the sacred Scriptures, is, in his monumental achievement of translating the entire word of God into a language the people could themselves read.

By this lone light of judging according to the Scriptures, the doctrines which had so long held superstition's wand over mankind, were fearlessly tested and sifted. The gross "real presence" so persistently alleged as a Lutheran dogma, is a pure figment, an invention. Luther already in 1519 specifically denied the sacrifice of the Romish Mass, holding it to be unscriptural, dangerous and blasphemous. He taught that in the commun-

ion there was no transformation of bread and wine: bread remained bread and wine, wine. He therefore, with no sportive "wit," but with the vigor of a Puritan, abolished the priesthood which in the Romish Church was supposed to make sacrifices to the body of Christ for the sins of the living and the dead; and he gave this lordly power over men's lives and consciences, the further blow by the doctrine that "the real sacrifice was that of every Christian in his heart to God." Nor did this view of this sacrament "finish its mission then; but it has been the uniform view of the Lutheran Church. The sacramental presence of Christ is by none of its theologians understood to be a "local" presence. It is the glorified Saviour who is held to be present and who is received in a spiritual and heavenly manner. The charge of consubstantiation, therefore, with "impanation," and the like, is rejected as unjust. Calvin even, contrary, too, to the statement of Bancroft, and many besides were far from holding to the mere "memorial" view, but to the view of a "real presence" and real reception of Christ spiritually in the communion.

So keenly, in truth, did Luther feel the wrongs in the mass that he called it the "work of men and of artful knaves," "the dragon tail which produced a multiplicity of abominations and idolatries." The attendant doctrines of purgatory and indulgences he called "abominations," and if he did permit some forms, "pictures and tapers," as "matters of indifference," he gave them no place in his doctrines or devotional practices, for he wrote in the Smalkald articles, "We shall keep ourselves entirely aloof from the consecration of tapers, palms, cakes, oats, spices, &c.," for they are "mere mockery, deception, and delusive performances." To know his entire independence of ceremonies and robes as means of "imposing" by "magnificence" upon the superstitious credulity of the people, one needs but hear his ringing denunciations. "Holiness does not consist of surplices, bald heads, long gowns and other ceremonies devised by themselves." The "worship of saints," he declares, "is idolatry." "Confession and absolution" had all the weird power of the priestly claim of forgiving sins dashed by his saying, "It is not

I who confess and absolve, it is Christ." The liturgical ceremonies he required to be such as the people understood, and in all directions he stripped truth of the prevailing superstition and led men to exercise their own right of judging all teachings by the Scriptures.

This individual liberty shaped at once the popular polity of Lutheran church government. It is diametrically the opposite of a "high church" polity. It is well known that Luther began the building of the Church upon the foundation of the "universal priesthood of believers." The individual, with his faith alone in Christ and with the dignity of his personal character, was the unit of all organization and official power. To this divine right of the personal factor, all practices by Luther were made subservient. Ecclesiastical power is vested in this popular priestly office of all believers. This individual priesthood of the congregation had the authority to commission certain ones, whom they chose, "to administer to them the word and sacraments." The Lutheran laity choose also their elders and deacons, and compose one half of the ecclesiastical bodies. This congregational polity has always prevailed in the Lutheran Church.

This throws down the walls that create "orders," and it therefore effects parity among the ministry, and demolishes the doctrine of the episcopacy, the Apostolic Succession, and even the presbyterial "rule." Of bishops the Apology declares that "the Gospel certainly does not establish a special independent order of them." Luther taught that even the pope was only a "pastor of a church in Rome, and all Christians were equal with him," and that as a mere member of the Church, if he denied the Scriptures, he "ought to be reported to the brethren for discipline, as Christ taught of an erring member, 'tell it unto the Church'." If "Calvin abolished ordination," in the sense of priestly authority, he did not go even as far as Luther, who omitted even the "ruling elder," and said of the laity and clergy that "the difference between these two classes was fictitious." The real dignity of the ecclesiastical office was deemed to be in the "dispensation of the word of God," and "ordination had no further significance than that the special service of preaching the

word be conferred upon an individual by the congregation." Where exists a more popular and more low-church polity than this? Where is afforded a better opportunity for self-development and growth of popular liberty?

This doctrine of the universal priesthood of believers has also gone on to cleave the beam that united the Church and the State. Nothing seems more clear, and yet nothing is more misunderstood and misstated than this fact. When the ruthless hand of the pope, which lay on the crowns of Europe, was smitten by the Reformer, the power of the state fell away from the Church. When in the Church Luther assigned to the rulers and nobles the part which in any sense could be called "protection," it was on the ground that they were of the laity whose talents were to be used for a spiritual cause. The believing "temporal powers," he said, "are fellow Christians and fellow priests." "They carry the sword to 'punish evil doers' and to protect the innocent," "just as every shoemaker, blacksmith or farmer has his handicraft and yet belongs to the common priesthood." The Apology also teaches that the Church is a spiritual kingdom, independent of all earthly powers, but it permits us to use laws and estates as it does medicine, architecture, air, &c."

In the same spirit of independence of civil protection, he fearlessly addressed the princes who had embraced the Reformation movement urging on them as on other members of the Church their solemn duties as a "Christian nobility." Like a Nehemiah he taught magistrates not to drill soldiers or inspect arms on the Lord's Day, and vigorously urged and induced them to establish popular schools. Of unchristian rulers who would demand the surrender of the New Testament, he says, "They are of this world, and this world is the enemy of God." If the emperor should persecute believers for their faith, Christian princes "ought to refuse obedience." No ordinary reader of the story of the Reformation can fail to know that the supremacy of the Scriptures, as the rule of faith, and the right of private judgment Luther suffered not to be compromised. When even his friend the Elector rebuked him, he answered, "Rather than

keep silence," \* \* "under the public condemnation of my doctrine," by an imperial edict, "I would brave the anger of the devils and of the whole world, not to mention that of the imperial councillors."

This doctrine of equality among men and the universal right of the individual conscience to exercise itself according to each soul's own priesthood in scripture interpretation, made the Reformation in its nature a movement among the masses of citizens. Its life was democracy. It was the birth of republicanism. Luther, a peasant's son, was a democratic representative of the people, and having had in his own person liberation from the terrors of conscience as awakened by the Divine Spirit and the divine word, he rose to the mission of unbinding the chains on the race of that age. Severing himself courageously from pope, emperor, edicts, councils, fathers and traditions, he sought the welfare of the masses by calling on their own mental and moral resources to deliver themselves. It was not until his tongue of fire spoke that the people had for centuries heard any real preaching. He awakened the people's minds by the herculean task of translating the Scriptures; and, in constructing the language of his nation, he visited the shops, stores and farms so as to get the simple words of the common people with which to make his inimitable translation understood by all men. And in addition to simplifying the "ceremonies" to the comprehension of the worshipers, he organized extensive plans for the great religious visitations in the German states for the express purpose of instructing the "multitudes;" and to the same end, as early as 1520, wrote a small catechism or text-book to aid parents and children in Scripture study in their homes. These evangelical and popular methods struck so deeply into the soul and into the fallen intelligence of mankind, that men arose as from the soil of a cemetery, and a resurrection had come into a new world, with small and great, without priest, worshiping for themselves before the throne. Though Bancroft saw not this democratic throng in Luther's day, it was there nevertheless, in such a host that it laid open the Reformation to the charge from such as Goethe, that it "threw back the

intellectual progress of mankind for centuries, by calling in the passions of the multitude to decide on subjects which ought to have been left to the learned." In the midst of this immensely popular movement, "if Luther had been a smaller man," he would, like the Puritan Cromwell, have taken the reins of government himself; but instead of ruling the people he spent his life as a professor at the university and a preacher of the word, and thus, as Christ did, without the civil sceptre elaborated, in the developing minds and hearts of the people, forces by which they might rule themselves.

The genius, too, of this Reformation was broad enough to always adapt its principles in various emergencies to the welfare of the people. This was demonstrated at the time of the fanatical uprising of the peasants. True, our American historian has declared this uprising to be a better demonstration of the principles of liberty than Lutheranism. It was so, verily, if independence and liberty imply a license to violently destroy property and to imprison and execute any who were not of their own opinions. These insurgents and Anabaptists, besides teaching that "the Holy Ghost was no more than a man's mind or reason;" that "Christ was not born of a virgin;" and "had sinned;" "that there was no future punishment;" that "a Christian may violate the moral law and yet not sin," and that the most repulsive forms of polygamy may be practiced innocently, also "murdered thousands of citizens unmercifully." Consistently enough do some authors hold up these law-breakers and persecutors, as men of liberty. But one becomes impatient on seeing it claimed that Luther was the enemy of these people because he was the friend of priestly and civil power. The fact is, that Luther, consistently as ever, went out amongst them and by addressing them sought to restrain them by kindly advice. He told them they might "elect their own pastors," even though Anabaptist pastors, and that, restraining their excesses against others' liberties, they might enjoy their own. The civil authorities he besought to control the fanatics not with the sword but by "peaceful measures." When they were impressed, Michelet informs us, it was not for their opinions but for their "irregulari-

ties." Thus Luther proved himself the friend of the people while Zwingli of "Democratic Switzerland," cut these same masses down with the sword.

The course and views of Luther must be admitted as in harmony with the principles that now obtain acceptance. He kept the medium way of binding no man's conscience by the dictates of church or state. He compelled no man to be religious, either on the throne or on the farm. Steering clear of an oppressive hierarchy, he at the same time exercised an authority, but, it was the authority of God's word in the individual conscience. This lifted liberty from absolute bondage into healthy self-development without anarchy.

Now as Lutheranism does contain unmistakably the root of liberty's tree, where stand the faiths to which Bancroft has ascribed this exclusively?

Calvin's system of government was a theocratic one, his "consistory" in Geneva enforcing religious duty through civil officers; and, while in England Puritans once charged Presbyterians with seeking to control the state, the Puritans themselves, when favored by Cromwell, were given excessively to civil measures for their cause, and for years in New England even had a law by which only Christians could be elected to civil offices. Here were the dangerous elements which have been erroneously foisted on Lutheranism, namely, the exercise of power to coerce others' consciences. As a matter of fact these systems became watchfully censorious against the free development of individual life, and oppressive towards all of other faiths. Calvin's Genevan polity, therefore, has been called, by followers of his, "an ecclesiastic hierarchy," "a Protestant inquisition," and his ruling elder, "a sort of censor." Kurtz defines it as "a thoroughly organized inquisitorial tribunal."

Puritanism in New England adopted the Genevan system, and hence the principles which were subversive of and retarding to the principles of American liberty. They had in another form the same old papal power against which Luther contended. A law existed by which the civil officers, who had to be chosen from church members only, had an important function in en-

forcing attendance upon public worship. For opposing this law Roger Williams was exiled. They drove the Dutch from Hartford already in 1640, and often the Presbyterians had to "plead" for themselves. The civil authorities under the church proscribed Anabaptists, fined and without mercy scourged their ministers. Other faiths were banished even as late as 1688. Women even were whipped publicly for their views. The officers of the county court were empowered to punish unbelievers in the Scriptures in case of obstinacy even with death. This rigor of legalism ended in gloomy superstition which hanged four Quakers, executed twenty persons for witchcraft and tortured over fifty into penitent confessions. Elder Winthrop had gone on in the work until he became "weary with banishing heretics." When once all of other beliefs were overcome the church and state establishment permitted only "the Congregational churches in their purest and most athletic constitution." These Puritans, even when they were within the boundaries of the Dutch colony, continued, possibly by fear of power, the violations of Christian comity by having to themselves "whole towns" exclusively "established in the Congregational way." This one and only "way," with other denominations expelled, in Massachusetts especially, made even the public schools, for which the historian finds so many words of praise, no more than parochial schools. But among themselves, too, the censor's rod was held up even over private life so as to forbid the use of church bells, organs, Christmas celebrations, and even the wearing of wigs, veils, long hair, as also to control fashions in dress, hoods of silk, scarfs of tiffany and the length and width of women's sleeves. Here was papal power grasping in its hand the state and turning, as in the dark ages, all society and even home into an inquisitorial tribunal.

Similarly the Dutch Calvinists, contrary to the spirit of our American institutions, managed to have the temporal powers in America, as in other quarters of the globe, to enforce obedience to the decrees of their Synod of Dort; so that from the first they persecuted their fellow Lutheran countrymen, each for attendance upon Lutheran service being finable twenty-five Flem-

ish Pounds, and for preaching, one hundred Pounds. Lutheran children were compelled to be baptized in the faith of the Helvetic Confession, and when a pastor was commissioned from Amsterdam to preach in New York the truth according to the Augsburg Confession, he was literally compelled within two months to return to Europe. Contrary to Bancroft's statement that private services were not forbidden to other denominations, Lutherans were forbidden on pain of whipping and imprisonment from holding even such "conventicles." These zealous denominationalists by the sword blotted the Swedish Lutheran colony forever out of existence. They were, besides, in frequent broils and contentions with the Puritans along their colonial borders.

William Penn, too, who was trained in Calvinism and whose doctrines proclaimed brilliant promises of liberty, had for years not spoken to his father and had used violence upon his fellow students at Oxford, because they would not accept his views, and became also, in the application of his system in Pennsylvania, such "a feudal sovereign" that historians have considered his return to Europe, in less than two years, the means of escaping from serious revolution. Even his followers, and the civil rulers of his colony for ninety years kept up an incessant "jarring."

These results of the system of faith which is given the glory for the existence of modern liberty, Bancroft seems to permit as necessary struggles for ultimate good. He looks upon all New England, for years a scene of blood and war with the red man, and of contentions among Christian sects, as an illustration of Calvin's principles which, as he approvingly affirms, "formed the seed plot of revolution." This author, though disclaiming to be an apologist for persecutions by Puritans, does, nevertheless, at some length plead that they did it "in self-defence." But how can self-defence claim the prerogative of persecuting and scourging other believers with whom they might have affiliated safely? The teachings of Christ give abundant rules of charity, had they only not "interpreted" the words of Christ by their "traditions and fathers." The writer who commends their system of gov-

ernment assumes to accept what is really the old idea of a rule as rigorous as absolute monarchy itself.

Unfortunately, then, this dark picture stands out, in so many years of tyranny, to prove that the facts have the place of more than incidental struggles by the way. Rather do they have the place of genuine fruits of former extreme tendencies. These tendencies were inimical to true freedom and were the only ones, outside of Catholicism, which stained our American history with the terrors and blood of religious persecution.

Charity for days of old and of peculiar circumstances should conceal these defects, did not standard literature assume to apply to Lutheranism opprobrious epithets for its beliefs and influences, and then seek to find the noblest influences where has been the sum of intolerance and cruelty and nameless bigotry. If in Europe Lutheranism has been in union with the state, still it has furnished the very doctrines of independency which America enjoys to-day. Why should these be ignored and denied as having an existence in Lutheranism, when they have existed in the popular polity of the Lutheran Church since the days that the Reformer invited perfectly free discussions at diets and conferences and evoked the free voice and votes of the laity?

We have now seen how Lutheranism contains truly the principles of freedom, and how the opposite of its polity demonstrates a clear failure. But it has been presumed that the free Lutheran principle does not sufficiently enforce the duties of moral and active life, and that therefore it does not produce that standard of practical citizenship which a nation demands. It is however demonstrated that this freedom does bear the fruits of healthful life. Lutheranism has dared to lean on simple faith as the sufficient power to develop individual character, and it has not been disappointed. The "indifferent" forms which Luther called "trifles," he eschewed zeal against; but it was lest men would "overlook faith and charity," the principal things he was solicitous about. Lutheranism does not teach that freedom from legalistic effort means freedom to do wrong. The servant of Christ, by faith, is not sin's servant. Luther's own life was a sweet testimony to the power of the faith he discovered in a

living Saviour. Michelet, the Catholic historian says, Luther's life was "admitted to be innocent and blameless." Erasmus says, "His morals are universally praised, and it is the highest testimony that a man's enemies find no flaw in him." Melanchthon says, and who else was better qualified to speak, "He was a most excellent man, gentle and agreeable in society and not the least obstinate or given to disputation. His great severity in combatting enemies of true doctrine was not from malignity of nature but from ardor and enthusiasm for the truth." He adds, "I have myself found him shedding bitter tears and praying earnestly for the welfare of the Church." "He was extremely temperate in eating and drinking." So that in matters of serious positive moment for character, he exercised and taught strict lessons of personal virtue and temperance, and even opposed the keeping of Lent and many festivals and holidays, but advocated the observance rather of the Sabbath which he held to be of divine and perpetual obligation, and promotive of virtue.

These principles which are the foundation of Lutheranism, in exalting the individual, have also powerfully influenced the national life. In the lands in which it has the most influence, there is also the least illiteracy on the globe, and there are, too, the most liberal opportunities for free thought, as Germany's thinkers and universities of such extended patronage have demonstrated. This liberty has led Lutherans by hundreds of thousands quietly to pursue their individual development without specially clamoring for control in civil matters, while their broad culture, in the ranks of the private citizen, has made them a preserving and elevating factor. Has not this been their history in this country? While in New England and about New Amsterdam matters were far from promoting the liberty for which they are accounted renowned, Lutherans on the Delaware and in Pennsylvania were engaged in important industries, and in cultivating the gospel virtues in their churches and among their children.

While others warred with the savages, they taught the red man the Gospel of peace for a half century, preparing them to receive and accept peace with Penn. While Quakers with their

colonial rulers kept up a scene of nearly a century's jarring, the Lutherans proceeded in improving self and developing soils, forests and mines for the universal prosperity. Hence it was that Pennsylvania, which, with its nearly two hundred thousand population, was said by Secretary Logan to be well "nigh a German colony," and whose Germans were, according to the common estimate, two-thirds Lutheran, "grew rich through industry." We learn through General Thomas that "the prosperity of the Pennsylvania colony was mostly due to oppressed Protestants from Germany." "Pennsylvania," says Bancroft, "the land of promise, grew rich in wealth from agriculture, commerce, ship-building, mines and manufacturing." And as for the further influence of these people in civil life and liberty, it is said that "Pennsylvania, of all the colonies, led the van of what the royalists call democracy." Even Bancroft says, of the same colony, "There existed the fewest checks on the people." There is a cause for this which existed in the people themselves. Dr. Dorchester, who studied these facts, says, "The German immigration was not only extensive but very pure, and almost wholly Protestant, with a high standard of morality and distinguished for Christian virtues." These, having come from the best farms of Europe, and from the better classes, and for conscience' sake leaving all for these then wild and dangerous shores, exerted a good influence by their worth. These Lutherans, were the first communion to exemplify in America the doctrine of liberty of conscience in persecuting no others for their opinions. They had no laws about "crosses on banners" and about private "dress!" The Lutheran Church polity and its sweet doctrine of faith laid on the laity such responsibility as fostered a thoughtful intelligence, interest and nobleness of soul. This conservative, unobtrusive, steady way of self-culture and industry, and non-interference with others, has possibly made them less noticed, but nevertheless has made them a solid social force that kept calming the turbulent waters until the nation's doctrines merged into their own. For, these principles practiced for a century and a half by hundreds of thousands, in

various colonies, before the Revolution for independence, must have had a not "inconsiderable influence" in fostering the spirit and culmination of American Liberty.

We must forbear for the present giving the long unwritten chapter of deeds and unmentioned names of these people in the actual origin and achievements of the war for Independence, and in the establishment of America's constitution, schools and various institutions.

But why should their share in this nation's foundations and building be unrecited? Why do volumes which are accredited as "standard" note the landing of small fleets of a few hundred immigrants from various lands of certain glorified creeds, while the incoming of thousands of Lutherans is without a record on their pages? One of these eloquently deprecates hardships, extols virtues and portrays the sufferings of almost all early settlers except Lutherans? Let him laud by name the English, the Scotch Irish, the Quakers, the Dutch; but why, in private, official or military virtues, embrace the Reformer's followers under the indefinite name of "Americans," and incorrectly call the Lutheran Saltzbergers "Moravians?" This might be called carping, did not the historian claim to build up his work on a philosophical basis and then apparently build his structure of material and facts which are hewn after his preconceived ideal. In truth, he is determined that the advocates and principles of Wittenberg theology are to be put up as the objects of his opposition and thrusts. His rationalistic and transcendental steel could not hew Lutheranism for his building. Nevertheless, this faith of the immortal monk of Erfurt has borne its testimony over Europe and also in America, building its stones in walls unknown and unseen by many, but building by its power of freedom.

When, too, men would reconstruct the history of the Reformation and eliminate the monk of the notable Theses on the Castle church, and plant the seed tree of liberty in Geneva, let them recall that Switzerland had a republic before Calvin landed there; that Farrel and Viret had spread Luther's doctrines in Geneva, and the magistrates had declared themselves for the

triumphant cause of evangelical religion, when even as early as 1523 Farrel firmly settled the case by preparing for the city a confession of faith, all which was several years before Calvin was on the ground, and thirteen years before the publication of his famous "Institutes." Even the great Calvin himself, some years after the Reformation had begun, embraced the doctrines of Luther; and he bears generous testimony to these doctrines and the Reformer's permanent worth and work, when he esteems Luther "as a noble apostle of Christ by whose labor and ministry the purity of the Gospel has been restored to our times." Calvin was truly a "bold reformer," but he recognized as others did, that their labors and boldness appeared after Luther had torn the papal tiara and made the imperial throne totter.

So, too, where Puritanism arose in England, the doctrines of Luther had long been sown, for as D'Aubigne declares, "At no period is it possible to omit the history of the Reformation in England from a general history of the Reformation of the sixteenth century," in which latter Luther is his hero.

We do more than merely defend Lutheranism. The facts warrant our proposing a theory different from that of writers who find the origin of our political freedom in a period following Luther. The birth of the German Reformation was the birth of our liberty. England, the Netherlands, Sweden, and every nation in Europe whose sons peopled our every colony, had through the Reformer's works and labors received the incipient movements of reformation. In various sections in colonial America independent influences had sprung up looking toward national independence. So that a dozen years before the settlement of the Pilgrims Virginia had its Protestant charter, and, but a year or two after these Puritan fathers, came the Dutch, and then in the course of time followed the Swedes, Germans and Quakers, all a Protestant host, sons of the Reformation, forming various communities desiring liberty long before the Revolution. These impulses toward freedom grew up simultaneously and side by side. It was the harvest of the sowing, when, as Calvin said, "the pure Gospel was restored" by the "apostle" at Wittenberg.

The acute Carlyle comprehends America in the ever onward movement of Luther's work, "whose light," he says, "was to flame as the beacon over long centuries and epochs of the world; the whole world and its history was waiting for this man." Of the effects of the Diet of Worms, he declares, "English Puritanism, England and its Parliaments, America and the vast work of these two centuries, the French revolution, Europe and its work everywhere at present,—the germ of it all lay there." Froude's testimony as a profound historian is, "Had there been no Luther, the English, American and German peoples would be thinking differently, acting differently and would be altogether different men and women from what they are at this moment."

---

## ARTICLE VIII.

### THE AUTHORITY OF THE SUNDAY SABBATH.

By REV. WILLIAM P. SWARTZ, A. M., Wilmington, Del.

The Sunday rest day is assailed by forces both determined and insidious. The world was interested in the fight for "Sunday closing." This was but one battle of the war. The day is assailed by the sensational Sunday press, and their week-day editions, by the liquor traffic, by powerful but soulless corporations, by the ungodly and irreverent, who refuse to recognize anything as sacred which selfishness demands for business or for pleasure; and by those Christian people—strange co-workers—the Seventh Day Adventists and their kindred Sabbatarians.

At such a time it is of the utmost importance that those who defend the Sunday-Sabbath should examine well their position, and prepare for the conflict. This paper proposes to consider the question, What authority has the Sunday Sabbath?

#### I. *The obligation of a weekly Sabbath is perpetual.*

The command, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy," no less than those others against blasphemy, idolatry, theft and murder in the midst of which it stands, reaches out with its imperative over the righteous and the unrighteous, the obedient

and the disobedient alike, from year to year throughout the course of the ages. We judge this from

1. The position of the commandment in the decalogue, God's unaltered law. It is in the very heart of the Sinaitic code, Ex. 20 : 1, 8, 17. To break it is to break the table in twain. If no other part of the decalogue is abrogated, why should any say this is?

2. We judge the perpetuity of the Sabbath also from its relation to human nature and human needs. It is made to meet them, and must be as permanent as are they. Christ's assertion, "the Sabbath was made for man," lifts the obligation above the boundaries and times of any single nation or people, and entrenches it in the life of humanity, to perish only when humanity perishes.

It is the universally recognized canon of judgment, that what was commanded to the Jews as Jews, what was founded upon their peculiar position and relations, passed away when the Mosaic economy was superseded by the new dispensation: but what was of itself moral, that which inhered in the nature of man as man, or was involved in his relations to God or his fellows, that is permanent. For instance, the commandment, "Thou shalt not kill," is still in force, but not so the law concerning cities of refuge, or the avenger of blood.

The third commandment provides:

(1) That man shall spend six days in work,—the obligation to work six days a week is as universal as is the ability.

(2) That the seventh day shall be spent in a holy resting unto the Lord, to which we are encouraged by the divine example.

(3) That a man is not in anything to oppress those under him, either son, or servant, or stranger by requiring or permitting them to work upon a day which should be devoted to the holy things of God. To deprive them of this privilege is to rob them of that which God has given them to meet the highest needs and the most sacred obligations of their nature. The third commandment enjoins these things and nothing more.

3. Some features of sabbath observance among the Jews are not of like permanent obligation. They are not included in the

command, and have therefore passed away with the Mosaic economy. Of this character are the limitations of the Sabbath day's journey, the attending to fires, and the requirement to worship in certain forms and ceremonies at the tabernacle. Ex. 35 : 3; Lev. 24 : 5-9. The Mosaic penalties for its violation are no longer operative. Numbers 15 : 32-36. None of these things are included in the commandment itself; they are only details of its application.

Of the same character is the observance of the particular day which the saints of the old dispensation observed. The commandment itself does not designate any particular day of the week. It is fulfilled when one has worked six consecutive days, and then devotes the seventh to a holy resting unto the Lord in worship and deeds of mercy. The seventh, the rest-day, may fall upon any day of the week, unless God shall designate to his people some specific day. But this particular day is not of like permanent obligation as the command itself, for it is not a part of the decalogue, and has no special reference to the needs of man, or his relation to God.

II. *The Commandment does not designate a particular portion of time, only a proportion. No time is made more sacred than any other in itself, only in its uses.*

The Sabbatarians claim, on the other hand, that God hallowed a particular twenty-four hours, the day immediately following the completion of creation. They hold that this is *the Sabbath*. "This particular day," they say, "is no more capable of change than is one's birth-day." All therefore who do not observe those particular twenty-four hours are guilty of Sabbath desecration, are subject to its penalties, and are denied its blessings.

But this claim is erroneous and hurtful. They who make it have no warrant from the Scriptures.

1. The commandment as recorded in Ex. 20 : 8, teaches no such doctrine. The amendment inserted by these Sabbatarian redactors does not bear the signature of God. As the Almighty wrote the commandment on the tables of stone, it reads "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work: but the seventh is the Sabbath of

the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work; thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates: for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day and hallowed it." But these people would make it read, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. *The first six days of the week* shalt thou labor, and do all thy work: but the seventh day *of the week* is <sup>the</sup> Sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates: for in *the first six days of the week* the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day *of the week*: wherefore the Lord blessed the *seventh day of the week*, and hallowed it." The Sabbatarians thus try to fasten the Sabbath to a particular day of the week forever, when the Lord himself took good care to do no such thing. It would have been an easy matter for him to have made the commandment read as they read it; and had he designed to fix the Sabbath upon the seventh day of the week forever, it is inconceivable that he should not have authorized their reading.

2. A second point is that God never allowed the term Sabbath to be confined in its use to a particular day of the week, as though the seventh day of the week and it only could be a Sabbath. A sabbath is a holy resting from worldly avocations to spend the time in worshiping God, and in such works as he accepts as done unto himself, whether the period of such resting be a day, or a week, or a year. Thus the day of atonement is called a sabbath, Lev. 16: 31, but it could not have fallen regularly on the seventh day of the week, for it was a fixed festival occurring on the tenth day of the seventh month. The feast of Tabernacles, (Lev. 24: 33, 34) was to begin and end with a sabbath, though only once in seven years could these sabbaths fall upon the seventh day of the week. Thus he has always kept the word free from exclusive reference to that portion of time which followed his creation as one day. Nevertheless, many

among the Jews held that Christians, even converts from among the Gentiles, should keep the Mosaic law. Therefore arose the contention regarding circumcision, the Sabbath, and the new moons, and the feasts, in the early Christian Church.

3. The New Testament expressly repudiates the ideas of those who would insist upon days and seasons, claiming that some are of themselves holier than others. In this it refutes expressly the claims of the Seventh Day people. Romans 14: 5, 6: "One man esteemeth one day above another: another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind. He that regardeth the day regardeth it to the Lord; and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it." Col. 2: 16: "Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a feast day or a new moon or a sabbath day: which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is Christ's." To the same intent Paul writes to the Galatians, saying: "Ye observe days, and months, and times and years. I am afraid of you lest I have bestowed labor upon you in vain." "Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made you free," 4: 10, 11. The apostle does not here disallow the weekly devotion of a day to worship and rest, and the maintaining of the same privilege for others. We have seen that this obligation is perpetual. Moreover such a day was observed by the apostles and the apostolic church. But when the controversy arose as to which day, the Jewish Sabbath or the Lord's day, and when some of the Judaizers claimed that there was a peculiar holiness in the very times upon which the Jewish feasts, and the seventh day sabbath fell, then Paul arose to assert the liberty of the Gospel. There is nothing more sacred in these days, and months, and seasons, than in other days, and months, and seasons. If any will observe them, let him do so; if it is done unto the Lord, he will accept it. But if any does not regard those particular times as more sacred, none has the right to condemn him.

4. The error of the Sabbatarians is further exhibited in the practical difficulties, if indeed we may not say, impossibility of such Sabbath observance.

In the first place, if it is God's resting which sanctifies that absolute portion of time in which he rests, then the Sabbath which we are to keep must be that cycle which reaches from the creation until now; for God has finished all his works of creation, and still resteth from them. The works which he now does are those Sabbath-day works which are necessary for the maintenance of his creation, and the equally divine works of mercy which make him glorious. To limit his Sabbath to twenty-four hours is also to limit the days of creation to the same length. But who does this now? Geology, physics, astronomy enlarge our conception of the truth so harmoniously taught in revelation and in nature: God's days are as thousands of years. God's resting is mentioned to encourage us by his example, not to indicate to us an absolute portion of time which his resting makes holy, but a proportion for these uses.

If, however, they claim that it is the first solar day upon which Christ rested, that he has sanctified as a holy Sabbath, and that this twenty-four hours as a part of absolute time is still to be observed, then is the difficulty equally great. In the changing of calendars and in the migrations of people the observance of just that time which has been sanctified becomes historically and geographically well nigh an impossibility. Chronologists know what confusion confronts them at several periods of history, so that certainty is impossible. Then again, from longitude to longitude the day varies; and it is midnight in China when it is noon in America. When the English sailors first visited Pitcairn's Island they arrived on Saturday, and found the islanders, with John Adams at their head, keeping the Christian Sabbath. The two parties had gone to the island from different directions. The consequence was, that the Sunday of the one was the Saturday of the other, and the Monday of the one was the Sunday of the other. Each company might continue to keep its own Sabbath were it not for the confusion which would result in their living together, and each would be literally keeping the commandment.

No position except that of the Apostle Paul and the New  
VOL. XXIV. No. 1.

Testament is tenable. It is not any particular portion of time which God has sanctified, but rather that proportion which humanity needs for its highest physical and spiritual well-being. No portion of time is made more sacred than another in itself, only in its use.

III. *Though God has not made any time more sacred in itself than another, nevertheless the purposes of the commandment, and the commandment itself demand a certain day which all shall observe as the Sabbath; and there is reason to believe that God has indicated a day for us.*

This is in direct opposition to those who claim, that, as no time is more sacred than another, the commandment is as well obeyed when each one keeps the day that suits his fancy.

1. When a common day is not observed, there is soon no Sabbath. History is the proof. The ramifications of civilization are such, that should men observe some one, some another day the wheels of industry would be constantly blocked. Let one branch of trade choose one day, and another another day, and there would arise such pressure from those who work, that on every day all lines of industry would before long be pressed into action. If one wheel in a watch is stopped, all must stop. If one goes all must go. So, largely, with our complex modern civilization.

The necessities of worship require a fixed and common day for its appointments. The exclusion of the world and its every day affairs, from which the Sabbath should be sacred, becomes impossible without a common day. Thus, therefore, the very purpose of the institution depends, in no little measure upon the observance of one day.

2. It is beyond dispute that God did designate a day for Israel. While it is not in the commandment, it was in connection with the giving of the manna, Ex. 16 : 22-26. The observance of this day was a memorial of their deliverance from the bondage of Egypt. "And remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand and a stretched out arm: there-

fore the Lord thy God commandeth thee to keep the Sabbath day," Deut. 5 : 15.

That the observance of this particular day was not incumbent upon other nations than Israel is apparent from the fact, that their keeping the Sabbath upon this day throughout their generations was to distinguish them, and was to be the sign of the covenant which God made with them. Exodus 31 : 16, 17 is the proof. "Verily my Sabbaths ye shall keep: for it is a sign between me and you throughout your generations; that ye may know that I am the Lord that doth sanctify you. \* \* Wherefore the children of Israel shall keep the Sabbath, to observe the Sabbath throughout their generations, for a perpetual covenant. It is a sign between me and the children of Israel forever."

There are not wanting some foreshadowings of a change under the Gospel. Under it there was to be a different day of rest and worship. Two of these may be noticed.

The first is Psalms 118 : 22-24. This Psalm is quoted by Christ as referring to himself. "The stone which the builders refused is become the headstone of the corner. This is the Lord's doing, it is marvelous in our eyes. This is the day which the Lord had made, we will rejoice and be glad in it." The rejection at once brings to mind his sufferings and death; while the declaration, that this stone is become the head of the corner, proclaims his triumphant session at the right-hand of the Father, in glory, raised above all principalities and powers in heavenly places. This day of his triumph is the Lord's day, we will rejoice and be glad in it. It is the day which the Lord hath made. Now this great day of his triumph we are expressly told is the first day of the week. The day when he poured out his Spirit as a token of his enthronement was the first day of the week. This is the Lord's day. But the seventh day of the week when Christ lay in the tomb was the saddest day in the life of the infant church. It was a day of gloom and of fears. But the Lord's day is to be a day of gladness. What day more joyful than that on which the vision of angels appeared, saying unto them, "He is not here, he is risen," than

that on which the Master himself, risen from the dead, appeared unto Mary in the garden, and to the two as they were on the way to Emmaus, and to the ten as they gathered for worship in the upper room in Jerusalem?

A second preparation for the coming prominence of the first day of the week is found in the separation of it from other days in the mind of God's people. Upon the eighth day God made special appointment to meet Aaron and his sons. Lev. 9 : 1. Moreover in Ezekiel 43 : 27 it is pointed out as the day upon which, after the ceremonial offerings for purification had been offered, God's people should be accepted in bringing a suitable sacrifice: so now upon the eighth day, after the ceremonial sacrifices of the law have been fulfilled, we are accepted in the sacrifice which we plead, once offered yet ever sufficient.

3. In answer to the need of a common Sabbath, and in harmony with these foreshadowings, a day is indicated for us, not by way of positive command, but by the example of Christ, by the practice of the apostles, by its acceptance in all ages by the Church, by the peculiar blessings of the ascended Christ upon those nations which have observed it. While it is not a matter of compulsion, it is still for all these reasons most suitable, that this day, the first day of the week, the Lord's day, should in this dispensation be hallowed in obedience to the sabbath law.

Let us examine briefly and in their order these reasons for observing a Sunday rather than a Saturday sabbath.

(1) The absence of a positive, recorded command from Christ, abrogating the seventh day and instituting the first day sabbath, out of which the Sabbatarians make so much, is really of little force. It is not necessary as they claim, nor is it even likely, that Christ would have published a formal decree abolishing the old and establishing the new. He takes away the old, but he does not explode it. He uses leaven not dynamite to work his changes. He puts the new side by side with the old, and cause it to grow, while he allows the old to perish. This is the analogy of his working in all things. The light struggles with the darkness and conquers; though first there must be the gloaming then the twilight, and at last the day rising gradually

to its zenith of glory. When the new life is given to man, the old is not at once destroyed. When the new faith was brought into the world by Jesus, the old did not immediately perish. The Christian law of liberty did not in a day supersede in practice the rites of the Jewish economy. Indeed there are some to-day who, after nineteen hundred years of the Gospel, are still Israelites practicing the ritualism of Moses. But the light is better than the darkness; the new life than the old life; and the gospel dispensation than the dispensation of types and figures. Who claims that circumcision is obligatory now? Yet there is no record that Christ ever spake a word abolishing it. What Christian eats the passover as the Jews did? Christ left no express command abolishing it. Rather on that last night, just before his betrayal, he ate the feast with his disciples. Had Christ or his disciples left an explicit command enjoining the observance of the first day of the week, and interdicting the seventh, that would have violated the analogy of God's dealings in every thing else; it would have made the day of rigid obligation, and have robbed it in just so much of its prophesied character of spontaneity and joy,

That Christ when dwelling among men in the flesh kept the Saturday sabbath, is made a conclusive argument by the Sabbatharians. But they should remember that the same argument would make the whole Mosaic system obligatory upon us, for he observed it all. Christ lived in the old dispensation, and of course observed its sabbath.

It is beyond denial that Christ has shown his Church special favor upon the first day of the week. Upon it he conquered death, and arose to bless the world. Matt. 28:1; Mark 16:2; Luke 24:1; John 20:1. It is thus emphatically his day. Ps. 118:24. He selected this day to meet his worshiping people. The second Lord's day meeting, at which Thomas was present, bears every evidence of being, as it has been said, "of divine appointment." John 20:26. It is just seven weeks after the resurrection, upon the day of Pentecost, that year the first day of the week, that he poured out the Holy Ghost. Acts 2:1. There can be no doubt but that this increased the joy with

which the first day of the week was greeted, and made it in the disciples' minds a day conspicuous for its blessings, for the manifestation of the divine approval of their gatherings, and altogether such a day as that prophesied in the Psalm. Ps. 118 : 24. It was on this day that the Lord bestowed upon his Church the first signal victories of the Gospel.

(2) The practice of the apostles supports this position. Much has been made of the fact that after the resurrection for years and years the apostles went to the synagogues upon the seventh day of the week, which the historian continued to call the sabbath. Naturally the disciples, like good fishermen, went on the Jews' sabbath to the Jewish synagogue after those who, because they were Jews and not Christians, met there on that day to observe the Jewish customs.

On the other hand it is remarkable that the apostles, trained from their childhood in the rites and prejudices of the Jews, should have given such prominence to the first day of the week for all sabbath purposes. In narratives where no account is taken of one day above another,—the Jewish Sabbath being mentioned only to show the technical grounds upon which the enemies of Christ based their opposition to him,—in narratives where all days are treated alike, it is a fact of no small import, that the evangelists should take such pains to name the day upon which Christ arose, the day upon which he repeatedly met them, the day upon which he gave his waiting people the blessing of the Holy Ghost.

In Acts 20 : 7 we read that Paul tarried until after the first day of the week, on which the "disciples came together to break bread," that he might observe it with them in preaching the Gospel, in administering the sacrament, and then on the morrow, Monday, he departed on his journey. He had waited at Troas seven days, from one Monday to the next, that he might enjoy a Sabbath with that church.

In the tenth chapter of Hebrews Christians are cautioned not to forsake the assembling of themselves together. Now every assembly must have an appointed day and time. When this was in the apostolic church is indicated above as the first day of

the week. This position will presently be strengthened by the testimony of the apostolic fathers.

The first day of the week is also named as the day for worshiping God by offerings. Paul so charges the Church at Corinth, and tells them that like instructions had been given to the churches of Galatia, 1 Cor. 16 : 1.

The canon of the New Testament closes showing us the venerable Apostle John, filled with the Holy Ghost, holding converse on the Lord's day with him, who is the Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the offspring and the root of David, and the bright and morning star; and seeing visions of the world's future and of heaven's glory; and hearing invitations of salvation which were to be sent at once on that very day, the Lord's day, (T. 1 : 1) to all men.

It is beyond positive proof either way, but the probability is that the apostles departed from the observance of the seventh day of the week, to which all their prejudices bound them, only under the clear instructions of Christ. We know that after his resurrection Christ gave commandments to his apostles, and spake often to them the things pertaining to the kingdom of God, and that these commandments and instructions are largely unrecorded, John 20 : 30-39; 21 : 25; Acts 1 : 3. The last passage reads: "He was taken up after that he through the Holy Ghost had given commands unto the apostles whom he had chosen: To whom also he showed himself alive after his passion by many infallible proofs, being seen of them forty days and speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God." It is certain that these unrecorded instructions of Christ must have controlled the apostles in the development and oversight of the early Church. Is it improbable that they were instructed on this very matter? At all events these inspired men, filled and guided of the Holy Ghost, have not transgressed God's law or his will in giving this prominence to the first day of the week as a Christian Sabbath.

(3) We appeal also to the practice of the early Church, as it is recorded in the ecclesiastical writings of the ante-Nicene Fathers. Their testimony establishes beyond the power of dis-

pute, that they believed that the Lord's day was celebrated by the command of the apostles acting under the instruction of Christ. Let us hear the witnesses.

a. Ignatius [b. A. D. 30; d. A. D. 100] of whom tradition says, that he was the child whom the Master set in the midst of his disciples to teach them humility, and who is probably correctly reputed a disciple of the apostle John, says, in the Epistle to the Magnesians the ninth chapter, "Those who were brought up in the ancient order of things have come to the possession of a new hope, no longer sabbatizing, but living in the observance of the Lord's day, on which our life has sprung up again by him."

b. Barnabas, A. D. 100, the Alexandrian Jew, devotes the fifteenth chapter of his epistle to "The False and the True Sabbath," and concludes, "Wherefore also we keep the eighth day with joyfulness of heart, the day on which Jesus rose again from the dead," Ez. 53:27.

c. A third witness is Justin, the Martyr, who was born, A. D. 110, whose testimony is to be found in "The First Apology," chapter sixty-seven, on "The Weekly Worship of the Christians." He says, "And on the day called Sunday all who live in the cities or in the country gather together to one place, and the memoirs of the apostles or the writings of the prophets are read as long as time permits." Then follows a statement of how at these Sunday assemblies the Lord's Supper was celebrated, offerings were made for the poor, the sick and strangers, (compare with 1 Cor. 16:2) and the chapter concludes, "But Sunday is the day on which we all hold our common assembly.

\* \* \* For he was crucified on the day before that of Saturn (Saturday); and on the day after that of Saturn, which is that of the Sun, (Sunday), having appeared to his apostles and disciples, he taught them these things, which we have submitted to you also for your consideration." It would be well to recall here the remark made above about the unrecorded instructions of Christ to his disciples, after the resurrection.

d. The Bryennios MS. entitled, "The Lord's Teachings through the Twelve Apostles to the Nations," to which Prof.

Riddle assigns the date of 120 A. D., and many other eminent English and American scholars dates varying from 80 A. D. to 120 A. D., in chapter 14 says, "But every Lord's day, do ye gather yourselves together, and break bread, and give thanks-giving after having confessed your transgressions," &c.

e. Nothing can be more explicit than the testimony of Origin who was born 186 A. D. In a Homily (23) on Numbers, he says :

"It behooves every one of the saints and every righteous person to celebrate also the festival of the Sabbath. But what is the festival of the Sabbath but that of which the apostles says, 'There will remain, therefore, a sabbatism,' that is, an observance of the Sabbath, 'to the people of God?' Leaving, therefore, the Jewish observances of the Sabbath, let us see what ought to be for a Christian the observance of the Sabbath. On the Sabbath day, nothing of all the actions of the world ought to be wrought. If, then, you cease from all secular works and carry on nothing worldly, but occupy yourself with spiritual works, go to church, lend your ear to the divine lessons and homilies, and think of heavenly things, exercise care for the future life, have before your eyes the judgment to come, look not to the present and visible things but to the invisible future—this is the observance of the *Christian Sabbath*." (Migne II., 358.)

f. The last witness we shall call is Eusebius, born 266 A. D., who, the most famous and accurate of the early Church historians, speaks very plainly to the same purpose. In his commentary on the "Psalm of Song for the Sabbath day" (title, Ps. 92,) he writes :

"Wherefore those things [the Levitical regulations] having been already rejected, the *Logos* through the New Covenant transferred and changed the festival of the Sabbath to the rising of the sun, and delivered to us an image of the true rest, the salutary and *Lord's Day* and first day of the light. \* \* On which day, \* \* we ourselves coming together after an interval of six days and keeping as festival *holy and spiritual sabbaths*, we, that from among the Gentiles have been ransomed

*throughout the whole habitable world, accomplish according to the spiritual law the things ordained by the law for the priests to do on the Sabbath.*" (Migne V. 1191. C.)

Many other such testimonies might be given, but these should satisfy any candid mind. So well indeed was the observance of the Lord's Day known to be a distinctive mark of a Christian, that it was made a subject of inquiry in the great persecutions. To the question, "Do you keep the Lord's Day?" the historians record the replies, which were in substance, "I am a Christian, I cannot omit it." The celebrated historian Mosheim summarizes this testimony thus: "All Christians were unanimous in setting apart the first day of the week, on which the triumphant Saviour arose from the dead, for the solemn celebration of public worship. This pious custom which was derived from the example of the church at Jerusalem, was founded upon the express appointment of the apostles, who consecrated that day to the same sacred purpose, and was observed universally throughout all the Christian churches, as appears from the united testimonies of the most credible writers."

Finally, the ascended Christ has accepted the worship and rest of this day as the Sabbath which he has commanded. In Isaiah 58:13, 14, are promised peculiar and conspicuous blessings upon the people who shall keep God's Sabbath holy. These he has abundantly bestowed upon those Christian nations which observe faithfully the Lord's Day, and has lifted them up among all the nations of the earth so that there is not in all the world any nation like unto them, for power, or influence, or wealth or liberty or peace. To them the nations look; from them the world receives laws; in the light of their progress this century is made glorious; and all peoples are called to the enjoyment of higher privileges, and are promised a more resplendent future. Would this be so, if God had not approved of the Lord's day Sabbath? God's blessing upon the day proves its right to be held and kept as the Sabbath of God.

## ARTICLE IX.

## JEWISH PROPAGANDA IN THE TIME OF CHRIST.

By REV. BERNHARD PICK, PH. D., D. D., Allegheny, Pa.

## III. HEATHEN ATTACKS.

The Jews, as we have seen,\* enjoyed not only full religious liberty and special privileges—in Alexandria and Rome, but also everywhere throughout the diaspora. But there their very liberties and privileges became often the cause of continued frictions because of the anomalous position which the Jews occupied within the commonwealth. According to the then existing notions political life and religion were not only intertwined, but the one formed part of the other. “A religion apart from a political organization, or which offered not, as a *quid pro quo*, some direct return from the Deity to his votaries, seemed utterly inconceivable.” And yet the Graeco-Roman world was everywhere confronted with a religion so uncompromising as to form a wall of separation, and with rites so exclusive as to make the heathens not only strangers, but enemies. The Jews denied to all other religions, but their own, the right of existence. And in this their self-consciousness they treated them with contempt. As an instance we refer to the narrative of Hecataeus of Abdera concerning the Jewish Bowman Mosollam who acted as the guide of Hecataeus’ party by the shores of the Red Sea. A certain augur was observing an augury by a bird at which Mosollam shot and killed him. In answer to the imprecations heaped upon him, Mosollam said: “Why are you so mad as to take this most unhappy bird into your hands? for how can this bird give us any true information concerning our march, which could not foresee how to save himself? for had he been able to foreknow what was future, he would not have come to this place,

---

\*See article in April number, 1892.

but would have been afraid lest Mosollam the Jew would shoot at him, and kill him."\*

Such openly spoken contempt of the superstitions around was only one of the many instances which excited the hatred of the heathens and filled them with disgust against the Jews, whom only their citizenship and other privileges shielded from wild outbursts of the ever ready populace. Since, however, public sentiment was against them some literati took it upon themselves to use the pen, and invented some of the most absurd fables, thus exposing the Jews to the ridicule, scorn, contempt and disregard of the then civilized world, besides bringing direct charges against them. These charges and silly stories originated in Egypt,† and what Alexandrian literati wrote against the Jews about their origin, early history and religion, was soon taken up by other writers of the Graeco-Roman world.

The first to lead the charge against the Jews was the Egyptian priest Manetho (about 250 B. C.), who among other kings represents the Jews as *a people of lepers, cast out from Egypt on that account.*‡ This as we shall see, was repeated by other writers, and is accepted by modern writers as a matter of fact. Thus Milman§ says that, "notwithstanding the indignation of Josephus, the Jews were in all likelihood very subject to that disease (of leprosy). The wise precautions of the lawgiver against the malady proved its prevalence. Quarantine laws are only strictly enforced where there is great danger of the plague." The Jewish commentator Kalisch|| says, "of the various diseases endemic among the ancient Hebrews, none was more inveterate, and none more disastrous, than leprosy. It clung to them from the earliest to the latest times; it was by all but general tradition attributed to them during their stay in Egypt, especially in the age of Moses, and was together with other contagious disorders, not unfrequently represented as having caused their expulsion from that country."

Next to Manetho we mention Chaeremon. He also speaks of

\**Josephus against Apion*, I, 25. †*Josephus, Against Apion*, I, 25.

‡*Ibid.* 26-31. §*History of the Jews*, I, 142 (New York, 1881). Comp. also Stanley, *History of the Jewish Church*, I, 104.

||*Commentary on Leviticus*, II, 215.

the Jews as having pollutions upon them.\* More explicit is *Lysimachus*. He represents the Jewish people as "leprous and scabby," and subject to certain other kinds of distempers; that Moses charged them to have no kind regards for any man, nor give good counsel to any, but always to advise them for the worst, and to overturn all temples and altars of the gods they should meet with. This they did. On their way to Judea they abused the men, plundered and burnt the temples. Having come to Judea, they built a city which was named Hierosyla from this their robbing of the temples. In the course of time they changed its denomination, that it might not be a reproach to them and called the city *Hierosolyma*, and themselves Hierosolymites.†

*Apollonius Molo* charged the Jews that they did not admit of such as have different notions about God, nor have fellowship with those that choose to observe a way of being different from themselves, yea, that they were atheists and man-haters, the weakest of all the barbarians, who have made no improvements in human life.‡

Of course a charge that the Jews did not worship the same gods with the rest of the citizens of the same commonwealth which Apollonius and also Posidonius§ made, could not fail of its effects, and from it certainly arose in great part the conflicts of municipalities with the Jews, especially in the cities where they enjoyed the right of citizenship.

The most virulent scribbler was *Apion*,|| a world-famed charlatan and liar. Though a native of the Oasis, he concealed his Egyptian origin and affected Greek descent. Owing to his somewhat noisy celebrity the emperor Tiberius named him the 'tinkling symbol of the world' (*cymbalum mundi*), though as Pliny adds, the inordinate and unblushing vanity for which he

\**Josephus*, I. c., 32, 33.      †*Ibid.* 34, 35.

‡*Josephus*, Against *Apion*, II, 15-36.      §*Ibid.* 7.

||*Ibid.* 1-13; comp. also the art. *Apion* in dictionary of Christian Biography ed., Wace & Smith; Sperling, *Apion der Grammatiker und sein Verhältniss zum Judenthum*, Dresden, 1886.

was noted would have better entitled him to be called "propriae famae tympanum."\* He appears to have been profligate, unscrupulous and because he enjoyed the citizenship of Alexandria, he was vain enough to pronounce Alexandria happy for having such a citizen as he is in it. His lectures on Homer gained for him some fame, but for the rest his lying stories surpassed the inventions of the most mendacious fabulists, for "he wrote or lectured with equal presumption and falseness, on every conceivable object, and was just the man to suit the Alexandrians, on whom his unblushing assurance imposed." His hostility to Judaism was deep, persistent, and unscrupulous, and there can be little doubt, that the popular favor was partly due to Apion's virulent attacks upon the Jews. The points of these attacks were as follows: 1. That the Jews were nothing but strangers. "They came out of Syria, and inhabited near the tempestuous sea, and were in the neighborhood of the dashing of the waves."† 2. That they were the great disturbers of the peace at Alexandria.‡ 3. That they were not citizens of Alexandria, for if so "why do they not worship the same gods with the Alexandrians.§ 4. That "the Jews placed an ass's head in their holy place,"|| which was discovered by Antiochus Epiphanes, when he spoiled the temple. With this cultus of the ass, Apion connects another calumny, that—5. Every year it was the practice of the Jews to get hold of some unfortunate Hellene, whom ill-chance might bring into their hands, to fatten him for the year, and then to sacrifice him, partaking of his entrails, and burying the body. In corroboration of his calumny, Apion narrates how Antiochus when he took the city found such a Greek fattened up for sacrifice in the temple.¶

Another charge was:

6. That the Jews swore by God, the maker of the heaven, and earth, and sea, to bear no good-will to any foreigner; and particularly to none of the Greeks.\*\*

\**Historia Naturalis, praef.*    †*Against Apion, II, 4.*    §*Ibid. 5.*

‡*Ibid. 6.*    ||*Ibid. 7.* On the identification of the ass with the history of Israel, see Stanley, l. c., I, 104 seq.    ¶*Josephus, against Apion, II, 8 seq.*

\*\**Ibid. 11.*

7. That the Jews abstained from swine's flesh and
8. Laughs for the rite of circumcision practiced among them.\*

Apion, no doubt, had a two-fold object in view, to hold the Jews up to contempt by the grotesque accounts which he gave of their history and religion and rouse the fanaticism of the populace against the Jews by representing them as atheists and misanthropes. And there can be no doubt that many of the repressive measures which were taken against the Jews from time to time can be traced back to Apion's influences.

In Rome the Jews fared no better, and the material furnished by Alexandrian scribblers was readily taken up by Roman writers.

The Apion among the Latin writers was *Tacitus*. His hatred toward the Jews was almost demoniacal. We have already referred to those spiteful words which he used concerning those Jews who were sent as soldiers to Sardinia—"were they destroyed by the climate, their loss would be small." But he said some other mean things. Thus he said that the Jews had ran away from the island of Crete, and that the name *Judei* is derived from mount "Ida":† that they were expelled on account of leprosy from Egypt, and that when they were perishing on their journey from thirst, Moses was guided to water by a herd of wild asses, and for this reason the Jews consecrated in their sanctuary an effigy of the animal under whose guidance they had escaped wandering and thirst.‡ They abstain from swine's flesh as a memorial of that miserable destruction which the mange, to which that creature is liable, brought on them, and with which they had been defiled.§ They rest on the Sabbath because being pleased with a lazy life.|| Among them-

\**Ibid.* 14. In connection with the last point, Josephus tells us that Apion was circumcised himself of necessity, on account of an ulcer in his privy member, and that he received no benefit by such circumcision but his member became putrid and he died in great torment.

†*Hist.* v., 2. ‡*Ibid.* 3, 4. But Tacitus contradicts himself, for in chap. 9 he tells us that when Pompey entered the Jewish sanctuary he found it empty. §*Ibid.* 4.

selves there is an unalterable fidelity and kindness always ready at hand, but bitter enmity toward all others; they are a people separated from all others in their food and in their beds. The proselytes are taught nothing sooner than to despise the gods, to renounce their country, and to have their parents, children and brethren in the utmost contempt.\* That the Jews, moreover, would make use of no precautions against prognostications of evil, causes Tacitus to observe, "to attempt to appease omens by sacrificial offerings is deemed unlawful by this people, who are given over to superstition, but disinclined to religion;"† and he also states that "because their priests, when they play on the pipe and the timbrels, wear ivy round their head, and a golden vine has been found in the temple, some have thought that they worshiped our father Bacchus, whereas the ceremonies of the Jews do not at all agree with those of Bacchus, for he appointed rites that were of jovial nature, and fit for festivals, while the practices of the Jews are absurd and sordid."‡ Their frequent fastings is an attestation that they had endured a long famine, and from the unleavened bread of the Jews, Tacitus derives the proof that the Jews stole the fruits of the earth at the exodus from Egypt,§ yea he calls them "the scum of slavery."||

But Tacitus is only one of the many writers who scorn at the Jews, and as they all more or less touch the same points, we arrange them as follows:

*a. Low estimate of the Jews.*

Cicero calls them "a race born for slavery,"\*\* Seneca "a most villainous race;"†† Apollonius of Tyana is made to say to Vespasian, in Alexandria, "When one came from the seat of war, and told of 30,000 Jews which had fallen through you, and again of 50,000 in the following battle, I took the narrator upon one side and asked him, What are you talking about; have you nothing more worth telling than that?"‡‡ Even the calm and lofty Marcus Aurelius, at a later day, is credited with an expression of the common hatred of the Jews, which in its biting con-

\**Ibid.* 5.      †*Ibid.* 13.      ‡*Hist.* v., 5.      §*Ibid.* 4.      ||*Ibid.* 8.

\*\**De Prov. Cons.*, v.      ††In August. *De Civ. Dei*, vi. 11.

‡‡*Philostratus, Apoll.* v., 33.

tempt surpasses all others : "O Marcommanni ! O Quadi ! O Sarmatae !" cried the Emperor, when he passed from Egypt into Palestine and disgusted in the highest degree with the striking and brawling Jews, "at last have found a people who are lower than you."\*

*b. Separation from mankind.*

"The Jews," says *Apollonius of Tyana*, "have long fallen away, not from the Romans alone, but from all mankind ; for a people that devises an uncompanionable life, declines to associate at table with others, as well as to partake in drink-offerings, prayers and incense-offerings, stand further removed from us than Susa and Bactra, and the yet more distant-dwelling Indians."† *Tacitus* explains this alienation by saying "in order to attach the people to himself in future ages, Moses gave them new usages, contrary to all other human customs. With them everything is unholy which with us is holy, and that is there permitted which to us is abominable;"‡ and *Juvenal* speaks of them, as such who would only help those who were of the same faith :

"None to direct in the way who did not pray to their own God,  
And only Jews to guide the much-desired springs to."§

That this was no exaggeration we learn from Jewish writings. There is a whole Talmudic treatise which treats of the Gentiles, and the following extracts will best illustrate the relation of the Jews to them : "Three days before the feasts of the Gentiles it is forbidden to deal with them, to lend articles to them, or to take a loan of articles from them ; to make a loan of money to them, or to borrow money from them ; to repay them or to take payment from them."|| These things are forbidden to be sold to Gentiles : fir-cones, and the best figs, with their clusters, and incense and the white cock.¶ Men must not sell to them bears or lions, or anything in which there is peril to the multitude. They must not build with them royal halls, judgment seats, and stadiums and platforms.\*\* Men must not let to them build-

\**Ammon Marcellin*, xxii, 2. †*Philostratus, Vita Apoll. Tyanaei*, v. 33.

‡*Hist.* v. 4. §*Sat. xiv*, 103. ||*Abodah Zarah* I, 1.

¶*Ibid.* I, 6. \*\**Ibid.* I, 8.

ings in the land of Israel, and it is needless to say fields.\* Israelites must not put cattle in the stables of Gentiles, because of their evil habits. And a woman must not be alone with them, because of their evil habits, and no man should be alone with them, because they are apt to shed blood.† A daughter of Israel must not attend a Gentile woman, because she helps the birth of a child for idolatry. She must also not suckle a child of a Gentile woman.‡ Milk which a Gentile milked, and an Israelite did not see it, is forbidden.§ Wood taken from an idolatrous grove, is forbidden for every use. Has an oven been heated with it, when it is a new one, it must be broken down, but when old it must be cooled down. Has any one baked bread in it, the use of the bread is forbidden. Has one made out of such wood a weaver's shuttle, its use is forbidden. Has he woven a garment with it, the use of the garment is forbidden. Was the garment mixed with other garments, and these again with others, the use of all the garments is forbidden.|| When an Israelite did dine with a Gentile at table, and he left a flask on the table, and a flask on the sideboard, and he left them and went out? That one which is on the table is forbidden, but that one on the sideboard is allowed.¶ If one buy culinary utensils from a Gentile, that which it is usual to dip (in water), one must wash; to scour, one must scour; to whiten in the fire, one must whiten in the fire. The spit and the fork one must whiten in the fire; and the knife must be rubbed down, and it is clean."\*\* These are only general statements to show the prevalent feeling. Almost on a par with the Gentiles were the Samaritans, from whom, too, the Jews kept aloof. Already the son of Sirach said: "There be two manner of nations which my heart abhorreth, and the third is no nation; they that sit upon the mountain of Samaria, and they that dwell among the Philistines, and that foolish people that dwell in Sichem."†† From the Talmud we learn that "he who eats the bread of the Cuthites (*i. e.* Samaritans) is like one who eats swine's flesh.†† The words of the

\**Ibid.*, I, 10.    †*Ibid.*, II, 1.    ‡*Ibid.*, II, 2.    §*Ibid.*, II, 5.

||*Ibid.*, III, 14.    ¶*Ibid.*, V, 3.    \*\**Ibid.*, V, 12.    ††*Eccl. 50, 25, 26.*

††*Mishna Sheviith* VIII, 10.

Law are not to be communicated to a Cuthite, for it is said:<sup>\*</sup> he has not dealt so with any nation, and his judgments they know them not.<sup>†</sup> Whoever marries a Cuthite woman is as if he had contracted a matrimonial alliance with idolaters, for it is written: 'and hath married the daughter of strange gods.'<sup>‡</sup> Have strange gods a daughter, then? It evidently means he who marries a Cuthite woman.<sup>§</sup> A daughter of Israel is not to assist a Cuthite woman in childbirth, nor to suckle her son; but a Cuthite woman can help a daughter of Israel in childbirth, and suckle her child on her premises.<sup>||</sup>

*c. Sabbath observance.*

To keep the Sabbath and the Jewish festivities is for *Horace* the characteristic which classes a man among the weak minds, that is to say the multitude, *unus multorum.*<sup>¶</sup> *Juvenal* looks upon the Sabbath observance as the natural inclination of men to idleness:

\* \* \* \* "the father's to blame, who  
The seventh day always was idle, and of work not even the least did."<sup>\*\*</sup>

*d. Abstinence from swine's flesh.*

Among the Romans the utmost attention was paid to the rearing of pigs; among them pork was employed medicinally for very numerous purposes;<sup>††</sup> it formed an important item in their ordinary diet,<sup>‡‡</sup> and was in a variety of ways dressed, as a delicious dainty not only with care, but expensively that sumptuary laws were enacted to check the extravagance.<sup>§§</sup> No won-

\*Ps. 147, 20.      †*Hagigah*, fol. 13, col. 1. The reference it is true is in the text to the gentile, but the marginal annotator, Tosaphat, refers it also to the Samaritan.      ‡Malachi II, 11.      ¶Talmud *Sanhedrin*, fol. 82, col. 1.

||Treatise *Cuthim*, ch. I. In speaking of the relation of Jews to Gentiles, a Jewish commentator is obliged to say: "What a chasm separates the teaching of an Isaiah from the Talmudical doctrine that all non-Jews are from their birth, and certainly from their earliest stage of puberty, to be considered as not less unclean than a man afflicted with a running issue." Talmud *Avodah Sara*, fol. 36, col. 2; 37 col. 1. Kalisch, *Leviticus* II, p. 111.

¶*Satires* I, 9, 72.

\*\**Satires* XIV, 105.

††Pliny, *Hist. Nat.*, XX, 13; XXI, 21; XXII, 25; XXVIII, 9.

‡‡Galen, *De Alim. Fac.* II, 1; Celsus, *De Medic.*, II, 18.

§§Pliny, l. c. VIII, 51.

der that the Jews had constantly to bear the taunting irony "because they do not eat the most eligible meat."<sup>\*</sup> Plutarch discusses the question why Jews abstain from pork; whether, because of disgust toward swine, or on the other hand, because of a religious veneration for them,<sup>†</sup> whereas Juvenal laughs over that land of fools

\* \* "where the Kings celebrate the Sabbath with bare feet,  
And on the growing swine is ever pardon bestowed."<sup>‡</sup>  
and also,

"Where they esteem the swine's flesh as high as that of a person."<sup>§</sup>

#### e. Circumcision.

Horace sneers at this rite, by saying: "Would you diametrically oppose the circumcised Jews?"<sup>||</sup>

#### f. Proselytism.

*Juvenal* thus describes the 'modus operandi' of Jewish proselytism. After representing the Roman wives as willing to do and believe anything which an Egyptian priest may dictate, he adds, that when the priest is gone "a trembling Jewess, who has left her basket and straw, begs in her secret ear. 'She is an interpretress of the laws of the Jews, and a high-priestess of some tree, and a faithful medium of communication with the Highest Heaven.' The wife fills her hand more sparingly."<sup>¶</sup> Horace<sup>\*\*</sup> speaks of forced proselytism: if you do not give in \* \* like the Jews, we will compel you to give in to our crowd. How the proselytes were educated we have already mentioned before.

#### g. Jewish Religion.

*Cicero* calls the Jewish religion a "barbarous superstition;"<sup>††</sup> *Pliny*, "an insult to the Godhead;"<sup>‡‡</sup> *Lucan* alludes to their "uncertain Deity:"<sup>§§</sup> *Strabo* thought "that the Jews designate as God what we call heaven and the universe and the nature of things," of which no image certainly can be in reason attempted;<sup>|||</sup> *Juvenal* mockingly declared that they

\*Plutarch, *Symp.* IV, 4. Petronius Arbiter is of the latter opinion.

<sup>†</sup>Ibid. IV, 5    <sup>‡</sup>*Satires*, VI, 159.    <sup>§</sup>Ibid. XIV, 98.    <sup>||</sup>*Satires*, I, 9, 69.

<sup>¶</sup>L. c. VI, 542-552.    <sup>\*\*</sup>L. c., I, 4, 140-143.    <sup>††</sup>*Pro Flacco*, 28.

<sup>||</sup>*Hist. Nat.* XIII, 9.    <sup>§§</sup>*Pharsalica*, II, 593.    <sup>|||</sup>XVI, 2.

"Pray to the clouds alone and Heaven's celestial power."\*

*Persius* holds up to angry ridicule the Jewish custom of lighting on the Sabbath the lamps with its unsavory light,† whilst *Ovid*‡ regarded the Synagogues as the rendezvous for dissolute amusements, since "the beauties of the town were to be found there."§

#### IV. EFFECTS OF THE PROPAGANDA.

From the foregoing we have learned the state of feeling of the Graeco-Roman world toward the Jews, which was all but friendly. Contempt and anger was shown everywhere, yet the Jews were uncompromising in their religious tenets. Such a state of things was indeed a strange phenomenon. But the strangest of all is the fact that the Jews, in spite of the hatred and contempt of the Graeco-Roman world, were so successful in making proselytes to their religion, and if necessary by force.|| How can we account for this? The answer is manifold, because there was much in Judaism to commend itself to heathenism: In the first place, as Huidkoper puts it, Judaism taught the existence of a "Divine Being who took interest in the moral education of

\**Sat.* XIV, 55.

†*Sat.* V, 184.

‡*Ars Amatoria* I, 75.

§From the silence of the above mentioned writers, we must infer that the Jews did at that time not observe the precepts regarding the *Mesusah*, which enclosed the folded parchment that, on twenty-two lines, bore the words from Deut. 4 : 4-9 and 11 : 13-21, or the *Tephillin* or phylacteries, or the *Zizith* or fringes on the borders of the garment. May be that they neglected the observance of these rules, in order not to expose themselves to the taunt of their Gentile neighbors.

||To this Horace refers when he says: "And like the Jews, we will compel you to give in to our crowd (*Sat.* I, iv, 142, 143). It is strange when Gibbon says: "The Jewish religion was admirably fitted for defence, but it was never designed for conquest; and it seems probable that the number of proselytes was never much superior to that of apostates, \* \* \* The obligation of preaching to the Gentiles the faith of Moses had never been inculcated as a precept of the law, nor were the Jews inclined to impose it on themselves as a voluntary duty, \* \* \* and whenever the God of Israel acquired any new votaries, he was much more indebted to the inconstant humor of polytheism than to active zeal of his own missionaries," (vol. II, ch. 15). Did Gibbon ever read Matt. 23 : 15? For forced conversions see also Josephus *Annt.*, XIII, 9, 3; 11, 3; *War*, II, 11, 10; *Life*, 23.

¶*Judaism at Rome*, p. 17 seq.

mankind. This Being was represented as supreme in power, wisdom and goodness ; as having, because of his interest in man, made a revelation, which was addressed to his moral sense." Not so heathenism with its multitude of discordant deities, "*not one of whom was supposed to have shown interest in man's moral improvement or moral encouragement;*" on the contrary their own character as depicted make them unfit associates in a decent family. In the second place : a heathen who entered a Jewish synagogue at a time when the law or prophets were read, would hear of views which the range of his literature nowhere presented—"that God was to be served by justice and kindness toward our fellows, and by maintaining a right frame of mind ; that this was the service which he most desired. If the heathen listened to a judiciously selected psalm or hymn, he heard what might strengthen moral purpose, quicken right affections, or aid devout aspirations." Nothing of the kind was found in heathen literature. In the third place : an intelligent heathen could easily perceive that *almost* every book of Jewish literature treated more or less of moral duties, whereas the religious duties of heathenism consisted in nothing but rites, ceremonies and augury, which were utterly disconnected from morals. In the fourth place : Judaism believed in a future existence. An unprejudiced thoughtful heathen would be predisposed towards a faith which gave him hope.

The French writer Stapfer\* among other things which he mentions also states the point that "women who longed to be shielded from the universal corruption, young girls who wished to remain pure, felt themselves attracted by this strange worship, which set a brand on all sensual indulgence." And indeed no one can deny that in this respect morals were very loose. Thus Seneca complains : "Will any woman blush at divorce when some who are illustrious, and of rank, count their years, not by

\**La Palestine au temps de Jésus-Christ*, p. 131, Paris, 1885. (English trans. by Holmden, London-New York). Renan l. c. p. 77. remarks that the reason why conversions to Judaism were much more numerous among the women than among the men, is because the former did not find it at first a repulsive and in all respects shocking experience.

the (annual) consulship, but by the number of their husbands;\* and *Juvenal* mockingly exclaims: "Thus she has eight husbands in five autumns,"† while *Martial* sneeringly writes: "It is not more certainly, than thirty days, and Thelesina is marrying her tenth husband."‡

Especially favorable for the Jewish Propaganda was according to Schürer the tendency of the time toward the religions of the Orient. The religions of the classical antiquity did no more exercise an absolute attractive power upon the mind. The desire after something new led to seize upon the mysterious Oriental cultus, which became more and more known through commercial intercourse. In Greece, especially at Athens, the Phrygian cultus of Sabazius (Bacchus) had already been adopted since the latter part of the fifth century, B. C. The Egyptians and other Orientals did not follow much later. In the year 333 B. C. the Athenians allowed merchants of Cyprus to build a temple in honor of Aphrodite (the Semitic Astarte), as the Egyptians had already before built a temple in honor of Isis. The attractive power of all such cultus depended in the main on two characteristics which were common to all. On the one hand we perceive in all some form of monotheistic trait. Whether the deity was called Isis or Serapis or Mithras or something else it conveyed the idea more or less that nothing else could be put by the side of this highest divine being and that the different names were only different nomenclatures of one and the same deity. The other characteristic is the practical tendency of remission of sin and moral purification, to be sure only in the form of an external, often absurd asceticism, which all candidates had to undergo and for which deliverance from sin and evil was promised. But in spite of all it must be acknowledged that the main tendency was to satisfy a real religious want which in a more complete manner found its realization in Judaism.§ And the result was not wanting. "Many of them (*i. e.*, Grecians)," says Josephus, "have come over to our laws, and some of them have continued in their

\**De Benefic.* III, 16, 2

†*Sat.* VI, 229, 230.

‡*Epigram.* VI, 7.

§*Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes,* II, 554 seq.

observation, although others of them had not courage enough to persevere, and so departed from them again,"\* and "The multitude of mankind itself have had a great inclination of a long time to follow our religious observances; for there is not any city of the Grecians, nor any of the barbarians, nor any nation whatsoever, whither our custom of resting on the seventh day hath not come, and by which our fasts and lighting up lamps, and many of our prohibitions as to our food, are not observed."† What is stated here by Josephus is also corroborated by one, who had no sympathies at all with the Jews, Seneca. In a passage quoted by Augustine‡ he says: "Since, however, the (Sabbath) usage of that most villainous race, has so gained strength that it pervades all lands, the conquered have given laws to the conquerors;" and in another place the same Seneca says "let us prohibit any one from lighting candles on sabbaths."§ The same Josephus also stated that "at Damascus almost all the women were addicted to the Jewish religion,"|| and in Antioch the Jews "made proselytes of a great many of the Greeks perpetually, and thereby, after a sort, brought them to be a portion of their own body;"¶ while Philo states "our laws attract the world to themselves—barbarians, strangers, Greeks, those who dwell on the continents, and in the islands of the east and west, and in Europe."\*\*

From the Acts of the Apostles we get a glimpse at the real state of things. Thus we read of "Jews and Proselytes" (II, 10). Besides "proselytes" we read in the New Testament of such who are called "Fearers of God" (Acts 10: 2, 22; 13: 16, 26), or "devout" (13: 43, 50; 16: 14; 17: 4, 17; 18: 7),†† and who no doubt differed from the "proselytes" in that they renounced idolatry and acknowledged monotheism, visited the Synagogue and observed certain ceremonial laws. Thus we find

\**Against Apion*, II, 10.

†*Ibid.*, 39.

‡*De civitate Dei*, VI, 11, where the heading is "Quid de Judaeis Seneca senserit."

§*Epist.* 95, 47.

||*Jewish War*, II, 20, 2.

¶*Ibid.* VII, 3, 3.

\*\**Vita Mosis*, bk. 4.

††The Greek in the passages is *σεβόμενοι*, but we find also *εἰσεβέταις*, 10, 2, 7; 22, 12. In the latter place some authorities read *εὐλαβῆταις*.

proselytes everywhere in the Jewish congregations. From the Acts (8, 27) we learn of a proselyte who occupied a high position, as the Ethiopian eunuch; of Fulvia, a noble Roman lady we have already spoken above. Josephus also mentions Azizus, king of Emesa and Polemo, king of Cilicia, who were both circumcised and became the brothers-in-law of Agrippa II.\*

In the Talmud we read of a rich Roman lady, Valeria, who became a proselyte;† another famous proselyte was Poppaea, Nero's wife, a religious woman according to Josephus,‡ who had every gift except that of virtue, according to Tacitus,§ the harlot empress according to Farrar.|| But the greatest triumph of the Jewish propaganda was the conversion of Helena, queen of Adiabene, and of her son Izates, whom the rest of the family followed, to Judaism. Josephus,¶ and modern Jewish writers cannot be loud enough in their panegyrics on this royal family. The Talmud, too, speaks in praise of these converts. Thus we read: King Monobazus made golden handles for the vessels used in the temple on the day of atonement. Helena, his mother, made the golden lamp-stand which was at the entrance of the temple; she also set up the golden tablet inscribed with the portion of Scriptures relating to "trial of jealousy,"\*\* and was a Nazarite for 21 years.†† The mode of receiving proselytes seems not to have been alike in all circumstances. It all depended upon the teacher. More moderate Jews who were fully content with general conformity, and taught monotheism and morality as the only and necessary essentials he would certainly make many proselytes; but if he deemed ceremonial observance essential, he would necessarily present such views of

\* *Antt.* XX, 7, 1, 3.

† *Rosh ha-shana*, fol. 17, col. 2; *Yebamoth*, fol. 46, col. 1.

‡ *Antt.* XX, 9, 11.

§ "Huic mulieri cuncta alia fuere praeter honestum animum," *Ann.* XIII, 44.

|| *Early Days of Christianity*, p. 36.

¶ *Antt.* XX, 2-4; *War*, II, 19, 2; IV, 9, 11; V, 2, 2; 3, 3; 4, 2; 6, 1; VI, 6, 3, 4.

\*\* Talmud, *Yoma*, fol. 37, col. 1.

†† Mishna, *Nazir*, III, 6; comp. also Farrar, *Life and Work of St. Paul*, p. 173, 429 seq. (New York, 1880).

religion as would repel nearly all heathens. Very instructive is in that respect the case of King Izates. In his zeal for the new religion he was anxious to be circumcised. But his very Jewish teacher Ananias had the good sense and large-heartedness to tell him that the essence of the law was love to God and love to man; that one could worship God without being circumcised, which worship of God was of a superior nature to circumcision. God would forgive him, though he did not perform the operation, while it was omitted out of necessity, and for fear of disturbing a people and imperil a dynasty.\* Not so, however, Rabbi Eliezer of Galilee, who, when he found King Izates reading the law of Moses said to him "Thou dost not consider, O King! that thou unjustly too breakest the principal of those laws, and art injurious to God himself (by omitting to be circumcised); for thou oughtest not only to read them, but chiefly to practice what they enjoin thee. How long will thou continue uncircumcised? but, if thou hast not yet read the law about circumcision, and dost not know how great impiety thou art guilty of by neglecting it, read it now."† This uncompromising orthodoxy so struck the King that he delayed no longer and had the operation performed at once.‡

True that Ananias' views were not strictly Jewish, but his accommodation-theory seemed to have been practiced by a great many, in consequence of which the Jewish congregations in the dispersion received a large percentage of so-called "God-fearing" or "devout" heathen, who besides recognizing the One God of Israel, frequented the synagogues and observed certain ceremon-

\*At the baths and gymnasiums circumcision exposed the Jew to all sorts of affronts. In order to escape sarcastic taunts and ridicule many of the Jews who wished to pass themselves off for Greeks strove to efface their original mark by a surgical operation of which Celsus has preserved us the details. See 1 Macc. I, 15; 1 Cor. 7:18; Josephus *Annt.* XII, 5, 1; Celsus, *De medic.* VII, 27. †Josephus, *Annt.* XX, 2, 4.

‡"It was ever thu that Judaism worked, beginning with the Psalms and pure monotheism, and then proceeding to the knife of circumcision, and the yoke of the Levitic Law, in which they entangled and crushed their slaves,"—Farrar, *Life and Work of St. Paul*, p. 429.

§It is generally held that these ceremonial laws comprised the so-called

nial laws. What these laws were, is hard to tell;§ but it is safe to say that these "devout" and "God-fearing" Gentiles observed the Sabbath and the dietary laws, because they were purely Jewish and formed the laughing-stock of the Graeco-Roman world.

It was different, however, with the proselyte in the strictest sense of the word. As the reception of male proselytes three things were required: 1. *circumcision*; 2. *baptism*, and, 3. a sacrifice (the last two only in case of a female proselyte). These three requisites are already presupposed in the Mishna as customary\* and existed in the time of Christ. To assert, however, that the baptism of proselyte was borrowed from the Church betrays unacquaintance with the real facts, though it may suit dogmatical preconceits.†

As for the duties and rights of these proselytes, it may be said that they were regarded on the whole as born Israelites, though of course with some limitations.

---

precepts of Noah which prohibited, 1. idolatry; 2. blasphemy against God; 3. homicide; 4. unchastity; 5. theft or plundering; 6. rebellion against magistrates; 7. the use of "flesh with the blood thereof." But comp. Schürer, I. c., p. 567 seq.

\**Circumcision and baptism*, Mishna, *Pesachim*, VIII, 8; *Eduyoth*, V, 2, where, with regard to baptism, there is a difference of opinion between Hillel and Shammai (*i. e.* previous to the time of Christ); *sacrifice*, see Mishna *Kerithoth*, II, 1.

†Comp. on that subject Schürer, I. c., 570 seq.; Delitzsch in Herzog's R.-E. s. v. *Proselyten* (2d ed., XII, 298); art. *Proselyte* in McClintock and Strong's Cyclop.; Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus*, II, 742 seq. (London, 1883).

## ARTICLE X.

## REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.

HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN AND COMPANY, BOSTON AND NEW YORK.

*The Witness to Immortality in Literature, Philosophy and Life.* By George A. Gordon, Minister of the Old South Church, Boston. pp. 310. \$1.50.

A masterful and most valuable discussion of a theme that has a profound and perennial interest for all thoughtful people. Its purpose is one of mediation between the minds to which, in the nature of the case, few can have access, and the multitude who long to know the best that has been said on the problems of life. The supreme spirits of the race have bequeathed to us treasures of insight and thought on all the great subjects of human interest; and it is the laudable aim of the author to put at the service of the people and easily within their reach some of this wisdom already in the world, however far it may fall short of the desirable ideal.

Writing with this generous impulse of spreading the highest knowledge among the people, Dr. Gordon gives to his readers the old arguments for personal existence after death in a modern and attractive garb, accumulating the testimony of philosophers and poets, of prophets and apostles, and especially of him who brought life and immortality to light in the Gospel. It is a timely and powerful offset to the superficiality and sophistry which masquerade under the title of modern thought. It is the kind of reading that is needed just now, and for which we believe there is a growing demand.

E. J. W.

*A Sketch of the History of the Apostolic Church.* By Oliver J. Thatcher of the University of Chicago. 12mo. pp. 312. \$1.25.

This is not a book to our liking. The subject is indeed one of peculiar interest, and it is treated with captivating clearness, freshness and force. It shows, too, the author's familiarity with the alleged results of modern research, and it is even entitled to claim originality. The trouble is that, considering the well-beaten ground traversed, and the documents from which our knowledge of this subject is derived, the volume is rather overloaded with originality.

The view taken of the Twelve presents them in a light considerably different from that which we derive from the New Testament. Doubt is even thrown on their great commission: "If Christ had told them to

go into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature, &c., their conduct must seem strange." They were quite content to remain in the Jewish capital, the capital also of the new kingdom, which was to them "still a political, national one," "in which they were to be the men of honor and power." Christianity had indeed gone beyond the walls of Jerusalem, but no thanks to "the efforts of the Twelve." "This work was done by the rank and file of the believers. The Twelve did not even lead in it. There is no indication that they had anything whatever to do with it." "Laymen had begun the work among the heathen, the Twelve had only reluctantly followed. They had not inaugurated the new movement." "They had not comprehended Christianity in its freedom and universality." "They were not at all committed to the universal proclamation of the Gospel." "It is not until long after the others had broken the way and had met with unexpected and extraordinary success that we find the Twelve following the same method."

What a blunder our Lord must have made in his selection of such idiots as the founders of his kingdom! What a failure his three years expended on their personal training! What a piece of self-deception his prediction, on calling them from their successful fishing business, that their future success would consist in catching men!

With such an estimate of the human factors employed in the development of the Church, we are prepared for the author's ignoring of the divine factors, the power of the Holy Ghost and the supernatural guidance of those charged with carrying out the great moral revolution. It is once more a case of Hamlet with the prince of Denmark left out. The Apostles of Christ and the Holy Ghost had precious little to do with the founding of the Christian Church, which "before 100 was well established in almost all the principal cities of the empire, and was rapidly increasing its already large and enthusiastic following."

With what degree of safety our author may be followed appears from his self-contradictions on the subject of worship in the Apostolic Church, a subject which has wrecked more than one reputation for scholarship. "The worship of the Christians was free and unrestrained, and there was no fixed ritual that was everywhere followed." "Nearly all our information on the subject is derived from Paul's first letter to the Corinthians"--how about his first letter to Timothy? And it is evident from this that "there was the greatest liberty of speech." Is it not the whole aim of chap. xiv. to restrain that liberty and to reduce their services to order and make them conducive to edification? Does Paul deal there only with the teaching function, does he not also give directions concerning prayer and the responses of the congregation? Verily it is this very epistle which teaches us that "God is not the author

of confusion in the assemblies of the saints," and that in worship pre-eminently "all things are to be done decently and in order."

But the author boldly cuts the Gordian knot of apostolic worship. There was no worship. It "was not separated from their daily life and common duties," it was "not confined to set times," "every duty was an act of worship." "There was certainly no more than the faintest resemblance between their gatherings and what we call divine services." Even "the celebration of the Lord's Supper was not connected with formal worship, for, as we understand that, *such a thing did not exist for a long time.*"

Turn now to chap. iii., and note who were these people to whom formal public worship was unknown. Christianity "was for some years confined strictly to the Jews. Its followers had no thought of leaving the Jewish fold." "One has only to read this account in order to see how thoroughly Jewish they still were." "Thousands of the Jews believed and they were all still zealous of the law." "They seem not to have thought it possible to separate Christianity from Judaism, the Gospel from Jewish forms." "Everything goes to show that they regarded themselves simply as Jews who believed that Jesus was the Messiah." "The old bottles were to them just as valuable as the new wine." "Christianity was but the complement of Judaism." And even "most of the converts" to Christianity from heathenism had "undoubtedly for many years already been under the influence of Judaism."

And these Christian Jews, who "had no thought of leaving the Jewish fold," who "were still zealous for the law," and never meant to "separate the Gospel from the Jewish forms;" and "regarded themselves simply as Jews who believed that Jesus was the Messiah," had no stated worship, no fixed ritual, no set times for divine service, nothing more than "the faintest resemblance to what we call divine service," no "formal worship" for a long time!!!

Does not our author know the historic connection between the worship of the synagogue and that of the early Christian Church, that the Christian assemblies were called synagogues, that the synagogue worship had set times and a fixed and full ritual? Has he overlooked his own statement that the early Christians seem not to have thought it possible to separate the Gospel from Jewish forms?

Perhaps this is a case of specialism overdone. The Christian Church is ruthlessly severed from its root, the Jewish Church. The author should have first given us a volume on the latter and then he would have seen how natural as well as historic a fact it is that salvation is of the Jews, and this would have saved him from grave misapprehensions.

E. J. W.

*The Gospel of Paul.* By Charles Carroll Everett, Professor of Theology in Harvard University and Dean of the Divinity School. Boston and New York. pp. 307. 1893. Price \$1.50.

This volume comes as a new interpretation of St. Paul's doctrine of the atonement. The author, having given up the traditional church view of vicarious satisfaction, and yet recognizing that the death of Jesus Christ is presented as in some way an atoning sacrifice, thinks that he has at length found the correct explanation of the apostle's teaching. The clue to this is taken from Gal. 3:13: "Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us; for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree." Starting with this passage the new interpretation asserts that Jesus' becoming 'accursed' arose from the form or manner of his death, as being *crucified*. "He was not crucified because he was 'cursed' or as bearing the sins of men in any vicarious way, but was accounted 'cursed' because he was crucified. "The manner of his death," it is said, "made him ceremonially unclean." According to Jewish law he became, ritually, unclean, and a source of such uncleanness to others who should be identified with him. When St. Paul says: "I through the law died unto the law that I might live unto God; I am crucified with Christ," he meant that by uniting himself to Christ he shares with him this legal or ceremonial impurity, and thus was outlawed and became an outcast from the Jewish Church. "Now that he was a Christian Judaism had no place for him." The Christian shared the pollution of the cross. Now he could say, "I am crucified with Christ," standing outside of the law with its rules and hopes. He rests no longer in the law but on the faith of Christ.

We are compelled to say that, in our opinion, the author has utterly failed to establish or vindicate his proposed new interpretation of St. Paul. It confounds the distinction between the ceremonial and moral, and has plausibility, even the least, only as long as this great distinction is kept out of sight. It is grotesquely violative of correct logic, to infer, as this explanation does, from this passing out from under the *ceremonial* law, "the remission of the sins" that had been committed against the (moral) law and the removal of the condemnation that these sins had incurred. Or, when on this simple basis in ceremonialism, the broad and sweeping conclusion is reached: "The law was first abrogated, and through this abrogation of the law the sins which had been committed under it were remitted." Does the author really mean that the moral law is abrogated? Or will he claim that "sin," i. e., transgression of the moral laws, is passed over as a result of the abrogation of a ceremonial statute? The Church will hardly be led to this as the true explanation of "the Gospel of Paul."

M. V.

*The Divinity of Jesus Christ.* An Exposition of the Origin and Reasonableness of the Belief of the Christian Church. By the Authors of "Progressive Orthodoxy," Professors in Andover Theological Seminary. The Riverside Press, Cambridge, 1893. pp. 233. Price \$1.00.

Those who desire a brief, fresh, and stimulating discussion of this great subject will find one in this small volume. It is composed of papers which appeared recently as editorial contributions to "The Andover Review," republished here substantially as first issued. The discussion comes as a response to the unrest and questioning which have marked recent Christological thought. As conducted by the authors, the re-investigation and restatement become a strong and emphatic affirmation of the true and essential divinity of Jesus Christ, as God manifest in the flesh.

The method pursued holds the single question of the divinity of Jesus apart from any of the traditional Christological theories about which modern thinking has become disturbed. The question is examined rather from the theological view-point which the Andover professors regard as made necessary by the progress of scientific and philosophical knowledge. This view-point includes a very positive, indeed rather extreme, conception of the divine immanence and the idea of an 'absolute' or non-contingent relation of Christ to humanity. Whether or not the reader accepts the full measure of the authors' special views, or their conception of the atonement, he will find his faith quickened and assured by the clear and impressive exhibition these chapters present of the true Deity of him whom the New Testament offers as the Saviour of the world.

M. V.

T. AND T. CLARK, EDINBURG.

[Imported by Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. On sale by J. B. Lippincott Company, Philadelphia.]

*The Expository Times.* Edited by the Rev. James Hastings, M. A. Volume The Fourth. October 1892—September 1893. 4 to. pp. 568. \$3.00.

We can hardly express our appreciation of a bound copy of Volume IV. of this splendid periodical. We should be glad to examine each issue as it appears monthly, but the contents are of permanent value, and one may be the gainer in getting the solid quarto at the end of the year. It ought to have a wide circulation among our clergy and other students of Scripture. It covers ground not covered by any journal in this country, it has no superior of its kind in the English-speaking world.

It numbers among its contributors the foremost Biblical scholars of Great Britain, Bannerman, Blaikie, Cayndlish, Chegire, Davidson, Driver, Ellicott, Gloag, Milligan, Salmond, Sayce, Symonds, Tristram, &c., &c. A partial list of the contents of the September No. will give a fair indication of the variety of subjects treated. After several pages of

Notes of Recent Exposition follow Bilingual Inscription from Arykanda, Herman Lotze, Samson, was he man or myth? Renan's "History of the people of Israel," The Historical Difficulties in Kings, Jeremiah and Daniel, The Limitations of our Lord's Knowledge, Rahab and Another, The Standard of the Christian Religion, Comments on Great Texts, Short Expository Papers, and a Literary Table giving reviews of the Books of the Month, a racy notice of Dr. Strong's New Era being one of them. A very full index of subjects, Books, Words, Texts, makes the volume a very convenient one for reference. Certainly whoever aims at a thorough study of the Book, and whoever is desirous of keeping abreast with theological science, cannot afford to do without *The Expository Times*.

E. J. W.

From the same publishers through the Messrs. Scribner we have the *Parables of our Lord*, one of the Bible Class Primers, by Professor Salmon, who is Editor of the series. pp. 122. 25 cts.

A greater amount of clear and sound Biblical exposition we have never seen compressed in so little space. It is a book for the vest pocket, and is worthy of being carried wherever you go. The author makes an important distinction, commonly overlooked, between the Publican's prayer and other cries for mercy. The Publican prayed that God might be propitious to him a sinner, using (in Greek) a different word altogether from that used, for instance, by the blind beggar at Jericho who sought simply relief.

E. J. W.

Also

*The Free Church of Scotland, Her Origin, Founders and Testimony.*  
By Peter Bayne, LL. D. 8vo. pp. 346. \$2.25.

Peter Bayne is one of the most powerful writers of Great Britain, and he has chosen in this instance, as in his Life of Luther, a subject worthy of his graceful and graphic pen. No ecclesiastical movement since the Reformation has equalled in devotion to principle, in heroism, in self-sacrifice, in spiritual significance and in glorious fruitage, the stand taken by over four hundred ministers of the Scottish Church half a century ago, when for conscience' sake they surrendered their churches and manses and all the material advantages of a church established and supported by the state. It was a sublime object lesson to the world, a most worthy example to Christendom of preferring principles to patronage, of asserting the inherent spiritual freedom of the Christian Church and Christ's sole Headship over it at the cost of every material advantage.

The thrilling story is made the more intensely vivid by the galaxy of great leaders with which it is illumined, Chalmers, Candlish, Cunningham, Gordon and Guthrie—"that choir of morning stars that sang together at the birth of the Free Church." And as historian Dr. Bayne enjoys not only the advantage of writing with the fullest sympathy for

the movement which resulted in the founding of the Free Church, but also of having shared the acquaintance and friendship of the principal actors, to each of whom in turn he devotes an appreciative chapter.

The founding of the Free Church has never lost its interest to the State churches of the continent. Yet for some reason or other none of them have been able to cast off their bonds and fetters and to declare for that liberty with which Christ has made his people free. What another history might have been written of Lutheran Christianity in the last two centuries, if its State churches had been moved to surrender the government mess of pottage for the return to them of those spiritual prerogatives which are inherently inalienable, and which are indispensable to the Church's best state.

While there is happily nothing in the situation of American Christianity which invests this story with a practical interest, the author has cleverly woven into his compact web, ideas and principles which are of universal application and which must stir and stimulate the mind of every reader. We refer to examples like that of the lesson which Chalmers drew from the text "Unto the upright there arises light in the darkness;" "the connection which obtains between integrity of purpose and clearness of discernment, a dueous conformity to what is right being generally followed up by a ready and luminous discernment of what is true." Or such ideas as that "there is a certain light and joyfulness and elevation of spirit consequent upon a moral achievement."

From beginning to end the author keeps on an elevated plane and he carries his reader with him on this eminence and fills him with enthusiasm over the loftiest ideals in contrast with the worldly, the base and the selfish.

E. J. W.

Also

*Words to Young Christians.* Being Addresses to Young Communicants. By George Elmslie Troup. M. A. pp. 251. \$1.75.

In nothing is our literature more deficient than in wholesome religious treatises for the young. A cordial welcome, therefore, should be given by pastors and parents, and S. S. Librarians, to a little volume like the present, which treats such practical themes as Habits, Keeping the Soul, Holiness, Half-hearted, Earnest Living, the Christian Walk, The Friendship of Jesus, etc. Special interest attaches to these addresses from the circumstance that they were originally offered to young persons on the occasion of their first admission to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. They are characterized by the directness of personal address, by the warm heart of a pastor, by the force of a thinker, by the simplicity of an earnest mind, and by the soberness of a scriptural piety.

The order of service in which these Addresses had a place is appended. It sounds very like the Lutheran service used upon such occasions, emphasizing the parental baptismal vow in the infancy of

the subjects, their church-membership in virtue of this Sacrament and their instruction in the truths of the Gospel. The giving of "a card of admission to the Lord's Table," shows that the Presbyterians of Scotland have adhered more faithfully to a good old practice than some Lutherans of this country.

E. J. W.

*Inspiration and Other Lectures.* By T. George Rooke, B. A., late President of Rawdon College, near Leeds. Edited by two of his students. 8vo. pp. xvi, 261. Price \$3.00.

The untimely death of Prof. Rooke removed from the Non-Conformist Church of England one of its most useful teachers. From among his manuscript lectures those here given are published as a memorial of their lamented author. Besides the central discussion, which gives name to the volume, the other lectures are on Psychology and on Pastoral Theology.

Prof. Rooke's ideas of the authority and inspiration of the Bible, though somewhat different from the current traditional theory, cannot be said to be new. He, however, combines them with an originality and force which cannot fail to be suggestive and helpful to thoughtful readers, though they may not accept all the conclusions that he reaches—perhaps the more helpful if they fail fully to accept them. The discussion is marked throughout by a reverent spirit and an evident desire to take into account all the facts which a true theory of inspiration must explain. Its underlying conception of the Bible is that it is "*a history of God's revelation of Himself in Grace*, a record of the methods and events by which God has disclosed to men at different times and in various portions His purpose of redemption." Revelation is viewed as progressive, redemptive action advancing step by step and presenting the truths of salvation more and more clearly till fully accomplished and exhibited in the New Testament. Much of the difficulty in harmonizing the various parts of the Scriptures, as they are found on critical examination, is regarded by our author as the result of a failure to bear in mind this fact of progression, and of a notion that equally at all stages of the movement they must be a perfect didactic text-book of the complete truth and positive revelation. He quotes Augustine's pregnant maxim: "Distinguish the times, and there will be no discordances in Scripture." Upon this conception of the Bible as an organic whole, presenting a divinely authoritative record of the unfolding scheme of redemption, he rests his view of what is specifically named inspiration. This is what he terms the theory of Sufficient Knowledge. It makes inspiration dynamical and plenary, warranting the affirmation that the Bible not only contains, but *is* God's word, as being pervaded by divine power in every part. It views the writers as being divinely and uniquely prepared for writing by a sufficient measure of knowledge—"this sufficient measure of knowledge being the outcome

of supernatural inspiration of, and revelation to, the mind of the writer.' A divine element is therefore to be recognized in every part of Scripture equally with a human element, and the Bible is to be regarded as an organic whole, a divine-human organism. This principle of supernatural preparation and sufficient knowledge, the author applies also to the formation of the canon—an inspired direction in the Church securing the proper aggregation of the authoritative records. Along with the presentation of this theory, which seems to be so strong an assertion of essential infallibility of the holy Scriptures, Prof. Rooke indulges, it seems to us inconsistently, in admission of admixture of human error in some of their statements. As to the attempt to bring the formation of the Canon under the action of an inspired guidance, however comfortable such a view might be, no sufficient evidence is given.

The lectures on Psychology present many points of thoughtful suggestion, but also some misleading views which are in fact inconsistent with the general representation they themselves give of the facts of consciousness. The author's placing of Will, as not only the crowning reality of the soul's powers, but as the *primary* form of its activity, becomes manifestly untenable under his own treatment, the view breaking utterly down unless Will be regarded as at bottom only an "unconscious effort" or something below the grade of *rational choice*. Equally inconsistent with sound psychology is his representation of the phenomena of a "double consciousness," arising from the opposite impulses to good or evil in men, as involving really "two egos" in each. Our author himself decides, on the authority of consciousness, that our soul is a "self-moving unit, which we call the Ego, or our individual personality;" and to speak of this corrupt personality, which each soul or ego now is, when acting with respect to right and wrong with varying inclinations toward one or the other, as meaning that each one has really "two egos" or "two selves" in him, is not edifying. Such slips as these, however, are but small abatement from the general high grade and merit of these thoughtful lectures.

M. V.

## LUTHERAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY, PHILADELPHIA.

*Practical Helps* for Pastors and Teachers on the Augsburg Series of the International Sunday-school Lessons for 1894. By Representative Clergymen. 12mo. 441 pp. Cloth, \$1.25; Paper, 75 cts. Post-paid.

The conception of this book does credit to the intelligence and fidelity of the Publication Board, showing that it recognizes the purpose of its existence; the execution reflects honor on its enterprise and capacity, showing that it can not only do the right thing, but do it in the right way.

There has long been a call for a work of this character. A plenty of

"Helps" have been furnished by private and undenominational Publishing Houses, but Lutherans have justly looked to their own House to furnish them with Lutheran comments.

The differences between the various denominations arise from their different interpretations of Scripture. If we have any right to exist as a Lutheran Church that right is based upon our view of God's Word. In all justice, then, the Lutheran interpretation ought to be in the hands of all who undertake to teach in Lutheran Churches and schools. It is not wise to teach our young the doctrines of other creeds instead of our own, it is a calamity to confuse their minds with the teachings of others along with our own.

It is a great evil, also, to have the pastor give from the pulpit the Lutheran interpretation, and to have the Superintendent or teacher give the Methodist, Presbyterian, or Baptist view in the Sunday-school. On the whole this is worse than for the pulpit as well as the Sunday-school to serve up what Peloubet and others teach in the face of what their own church holds—and yet this has happened. There is now no excuse for such disloyalty to our own Church. The times of this ignorance are happily past. All good Lutherans are expected to supply themselves from their own Publication House with "Helps" which are "Helps," which will instruct them in the doctrines of their church, which will help them to understand God's Word as their church understands it.

The assistance furnished by the Augsburg Teacher is confessedly inadequate. There is hardly an intelligent teacher who has not been accustomed to invest in some additional "Helps," though the pastor's heart has been often saddened by seeing the character of the supposed "Helps," knowing that their comments now squarely contradicted his own teaching, now darkened counsel by words without knowledge.

On the 49 Lessons for the year 1894, this volume gives 49 "practical talks," by 49 preachers, who were evidently selected with great care, who represent all sections of the church, and whose fresh and thorough discussion of their respective themes shows how wisely the selection was made.

E. J. W.

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE, ST. LOUIS, MO.

*Ein Handbuch Zur Täglichen Hausandacht, aus den Predigten des Seligen Prof. Dr. C. F. W. Walther. Zusammengestellt von August Crull. 4to., pp. 513.*

A most admirable devotional manual consisting of choice selections from the various Collections of Dr. Walther's Sermons, "Evangelien Postille," "Epistelpostille," "Brosamen" and "Casual-Predigten und Reden." The arrangement follows the Christian Year so that the keynote struck by the pericope of the previous Sunday in public worship may continue to resound throughout the whole week in the several Christian homes. Thus on Sunday, and Monday and Tuesday and

every other day of the week, the Christian at the fireside, or the father in conducting the devotions of his family, keeps reading an edifying chapter on the same theme discoursed on by the pastor on the Lord's day. Until another Sabbath dawns with a new or related theme, the lesson of the previous Sabbath is through these extracts from Walther's spiritual sermons daily recalled, expanded and enriched among pious souls, and we may easily judge how such a practice must root them in doctrine, nourish true faith and promote godly living. What an illustration of the divine principle of order, which underlies true worship and Christian growth as completely as it does the material universe and organic nature! What a living connection is thus formed between the Lord's day and the other days, between the Church and the home, between the public ordinances and private devotion, between preaching and living! Whatever we may think of the extreme position held by these "Missourians" and their attitude towards their brethren in the faith, no intelligent writer will charge them with indifference to piety and the most practical and indubitable forms of Christianity. Happy the people who avail themselves of a daily spiritual handbook like the one before us! Happy the preacher who maintains a system in his throughout the year, and who manages to connect the private devotional reading of his congregation with that system! It can do no harm to learn from these thorough-going, energetic and spiritually-minded fellow Lutherans.

In view of the late controversy on predestination and the charge of Calvinism lodged against Walther, the following extract on p. 105 has peculiar interest: "Our reason cannot indeed think otherwise than that if God really desired all men to be saved they would certainly all be saved, but since this does not take place the cause must lie in the will of God. Our reason can indeed not conclude otherwise, but what says the word of God? As with a mighty thunderbolt it smites such conclusions of reason to the earth, for upon every page of the sacred Book it is testified that God has ordained no man unto condemnation, but has loved all from eternity and willed that all should be saved."

The same house sends us also Nos. 17, 18, 19, 20 and 21 of "*Erzählungen für die Jugend*," an admirable Series of Tales for Youth which should be found in all German homes and Sunday-schools.

Also *Der Declamator*, a small volume of German and English Poems collected by A. G. pp. 114.

Also, *Hedypnoia*, eine Sammlung geistlicher und weltlicher Chorgesänge für die gemischten Chöre unserer Gymnasien. Heft II. Besides standard German Hymns the collection contains "Rock of Ages," "Home, Sweet Home" and "The Star-Spangled Banner."

And, *Amerikanischer Kalender* für deutsche Lutheraner filled with good reading, and giving the ministerial record, educational institutions, &c., but no statistics.

E. J. W.

HARPER AND BROTHERS, NEW YORK.

*The Prince of India; or Why Constantinople Fell.* By Lew Wallace.  
2 Vols., 12mo., pp. 502, 578.

The reading public awaited with great expectations the coming of another historic romance from the author of the immortal "Ben Hur," and these great expectations have not been disappointed. The "Prince of India" cannot eclipse its illustrious predecessor, but in imaginative force, in the creation of noble character and the handling of them with consummate skill, in the power of description and in general literary quality, the latter keeps up to the high standard of the former, and it is destined to rival its unparalleled success in numbering its readers by the hundred thousand.

The tale centres at Constantinople and in an epoch when the great capital was surrounded by an ethnic wilderness, requiring a bold genius to attempt the reduction and introduction of all these varieties of race, language, faith and civilization, into one great plot. But the author has evidently lavished time and labor upon the investigation and study of that complex period, and he reveals a profound and, on the whole, accurate knowledge of the topographic, ethnic and historic subjects which enter into the story. He has lived in the Orient, has witnessed its life, has breathed its spirit and has been a keen observer of its distinctive features. Real facts are in the nature of the case subordinated to the exigencies of fancy, events are recast in the interests of fiction, ecclesiastical history is converted into romance, but the result is not only a charming book to read, but a fascinating illumination of a momentous epoch too little known and appreciated. The hero is the legendary wandering Jew, though the author's originality has transformed him into quite another character from the image commonly entertained of him. As he is traced in these pages he appears less than ever a person, but in his prodigious learning, his fabulous wealth, and his "universal Religious Brotherhood with God for its accordant principle," a la Parliament of Religions, he is the impersonation of the most wonderful race of the human species.

While we cannot but commend the noble characters which the author's lofty motives introduce, and the enforcement of religious principles which was the manifest purpose of the story, we cannot vote the author a success as a theologian, and we believe that theological interests would have suffered less had he followed Greek instead of Latin authorities.

E. J. W.

HUNT AND EATON, NEW YORK.

*The Student's Commentary.* A Complete Hermeneutical Manual on the Book of Ecclesiastes, Consisting of a Corrected Hebrew Text, an ample Critical Apparatus, a free and terse Metrical Rendering, a modernized and rhythmically arranged Translation, an Extended In-

introduction, a detailed Tabular Analysis, the Authorized Version Amended, the American Revised Version, a closely literal Metaphrase, a copious logical, exegetical, and practical Exposition, and full lexical, grammatical and vindicatory Notes. Adapted to Readers, Preachers, and Scholars of every stage of progress and of all denominations. By James Strong, S. T. D., LL. D. Large 8vo. pp. 144.

This somewhat extraordinary title page gives a sufficiently clear conception of the scope and contents of this work, leaving little for the reviewer, except to testify to the prodigious labor which it represents, the admirable tabular analysis of the successive parts, the successful reproduction of the thought, and the faithful preservation of the spirit, of the original, in the author's poetic rendering and the noteworthy exposition of the text. Altogether it forms a very creditable and valuable product of American Scholarship, but Dr. Strong's defense of the Solomonic authorship of *Ecclesiastes* will not compel a reversal of the modern judgment on that subject.

E. J. W.

## LUTHERAN PUBLICATION BOARD, BALTIMORE.

*The Ten Commandments Explained in Sermonic Lectures.* By William Dallman, Pastor of Emmanuel Lutheran Church and Editor of "The Lutheran Witness." pp. 320. 12mo.

The Lutheran literature of this country has been greatly enriched in the German language by the "Missourians," and this book gives promise that they will make valuable additions to the English Lutheran library.

As stated in the title, the contents of this volume are a Series of Sermons which the author delivered to his congregation. The substance of them also appeared in *The Lutheran Witness*, whereby their merit became known to his brethren in the ministry, who at the meeting of the English Synod of Missouri in May last resolved to publish them in book form. They are presented of course in a popular dress, and the reviewer thinks that their style would have been improved if the colloquial language of the pulpit had been in some cases modified before it appeared in print.

Barring the occasional lack of dignity, the volume entertains and instructs. It will be profitable reading to the laity, and will prove a helpful manual in catechisation, for it offers not only an able exposition of the Commandments but many cogent and happy illustrations.

The author's position on the third Commandment may be anticipated. He holds the Sabbath "no longer observed in the New Testament, and, what is more, no other day pointed out to take its place," yet declares on the other hand "And so is the Sabbath not destroyed by the New Testament, but by bringing out the full liberty under the Gospel of Christ the true, free and right observance is called forth and established." The harmony of the two statements will be recognized only

by such as have learned the essential distinction between the old and the new dispensations, between Moses and Christ.

Besides the exposition of the Decalogue there are chapters on The Law, Sin and Good Works.

E. J. W.

MACMILLAN AND CO., NEW YORK.

*The United States. An Outline of Political History, 1492-1871.* By Goldwin Smith, D. C. L.

This is the modest title of a most noteworthy contribution to the political history of this country. Falling in with the popular appetite for a good thing of this kind, we have found ourselves chained to the book from the first page to the last, and then wistfully looking over the fly-leaf for the fulfillment of the gifted author's promise that a companion volume should be forth-coming "on the same scale," and, we should be sure, with the same inimitable charm, on the recent history of "the parties, and the questions of the present day." If the promised volume can take rank with this, we want it without delay.

It is said that the first edition of this work was immediately exhausted—we should not be surprised at the phenomenal sale of such a masterpiece of brilliant generalization, such a condensed and powerful portrayal of the issues, and struggles, and life-history of our young Republic—such, indeed, as has not yet appeared from either a native or foreign pen. Some curiosity, no doubt there was, in the eagerness with which this book was hailed. It was to be the political history of the United States from an Englishman's point of view, an Englishman of noted qualifications for the task, one who has uniformly avowed that he "regards the American Commonwealth as the great achievement of his race," and who systematically advocates the commercial union of the Queen's dominions on this continent with the United States.

Put the merit of this work lies deeper and rises higher. Goldwin Smith is a brilliant writer—chaste and brilliant, if we can get these two literary qualities into a single compound—but he has in large measure the historical sense besides. Familiar, as every accredited historian must be, with the complicated detail of social life, and culture, and sentiment, and the deep roots of growing controversies, and the almost interminable tangle of party struggle—this detail he keeps back, because his readers will be interested, presumably, in the points of emergence for the growing life of the nation, and the grand total of achieved results. These he gathers up with a master's hand. If there is any doubt as to whether he has faithfully represented the discrepant colonial civilizations of the New England communities on the one hand, and the "bucolic citizenship" of the southern plantations on the other; or, for example, as to whether he is correct in his analysis of some of our patriotic idols, notably Thomas Jefferson, Patrick Henry, and Benjamin

Franklin; or, finally, as to whether his weighing in the balances the *pros* and *cons* of our great revolutionary controversies, first with the mother country, and afterwards between conflicting civilizations of the free and slave sections of our own country, the appeal may be easily carried to detail of dry facts lying so profusely around us.

But the iconoclasm of this book is altogether innocent. It is well for us that our heroes be now and then disrobed of their legendary glamour, only so that, in the end, they are not thrown down from the high pedestal on which our patriotic devotion has placed them. Some of Mr. Smith's judgments on men and measures startle us by their novelty, and a certain *ad captandum* way he has of dealing them out. But we applaud him in the end, and after halting a brief moment on the criticism, with a perceptible hush in our wonted fourth of July adulation, we lock arms with our delightful companion, and journey on.

The book has that quality about it, as to literary execution, which will not let us tire in the reading, and which induces upon the reader the two-fold charm of having said the right thing, and of having said it in a most engaging way. There are pictures of the noted epochs in our history, and of the great leaders both in the councils of the nation and on the field of blood, that for the charm of unique and realistic portrayal, and the warmth of historic insight and reproduction, have hardly been surpassed in the language, notably the swift and masterly survey of what the author calls the period of "*Rupture and Reconstruction*," and the exceedingly graphic and powerful sketch of its central figure, Abraham Lincoln. Indeed the like praise is due to the whole book.

We are almost persuaded to look upon the book as possibly the first fruits of a new stage in the development of the art of history-writing, in which the dry, annalistic, severely inductive habit, so long fashionable in this branch of literary work, and so earnestly abetted and practiced in certain university centres of our own country, is about to be given up. If the reaction is to take this turn, we may gladly unite our voice with that of the thousands of eager readers of this political history of the United States, in hailing Mr. Goldwin Smith as an enlightened and distinguished fore-runner in this field. By all means let history be written in this style.

W. H. W.

A. C. ARMSTRONG AND SON, NEW YORK.

*The Sermon Bible.* Colossians—James. pp. 376.

This series is nearing completion, as is manifest from the books covered by this volume, and is growing better as the series advances. The best sermonic literature has been utilized, and this has been done so judiciously, that the reader has the choicest of the sermons preached on the chief portions of the Scripture covered by each volume. It is not so valuable for full treatment as for suggestiveness, and in their sug-

gestiveness lies the chief merit of the whole series. Then, too, the references show where the reader can get all he wants, if he wishes to have more than the book itself gives him.

*The Boy Jesus and Other Sermons.* By William M. Taylor, D. D., LL. D., Pastor Emeritus of the Broadway Tabernacle, New York City. pp. 301.

Dr. Taylor takes comfort in the fact, that, although unable to preach sermons from his pulpit, he can furnish them to the public through the press. We feel like congratulating him and the public that this is possible. In sermonic literature he holds a high rank. "Dull as a sermon" has no point to the reader of this book. Among its sermons, in addition to the one in the subject, we find the Gospel according to John the Baptist, Risen with Christ, Early Piety, Seeking Great Things, The Silence of Jesus, Satan's Estimate of Human Nature, The Province of Feeling in Religious Experience, The Place and Power of Individuality in Christian Life and Work, The Plague of the Heart. The excellence of Dr. Taylor's sermons is too well known to need any detailed comment at this day.

HUNT AND EATON, NEW YORK.

*Outlines of Economics.* By Richard T. Ely, Ph. D., LL. D., Professor of Political Economy and Director of the School of Economics, Political Science and History in the University of Wisconsin. pp. 432.

We are gratified to find that Professor Ely has added to his other works a college edition of political economy. These "outlines" bear evidence, on every page, that they are given by one who is not only familiar with the subject but knows how to present it to college students. Chapter follows chapter in the natural and logical sequence, and his views carry conviction because what follows is such a manifest outgrowth of what precedes. The subjects most widely discussed by the political parties to-day are treated with judicious care and discrimination. We are specially well pleased with the author's views of what constitutes money and what he says of bi-metalism. His discussion of the tariff might have been more positive and decisive. It is the only part of his subject that shows any attempt at trying to avoid giving a definite conclusion.

Not the least valuable part of the work is the page, at the close of each chapter, giving a *summary* of the points treated, *questions* to be answered by the student, and references to the *literature* on the different subjects. The same may be said of the "Appendix" giving subjects for essays, discussions, and debates; courses of reading; and a list of works on related subjects. This is another evidence that the book was prepared by a practical teacher, who fully appreciates the wants of the college student. The index is full and very satisfactory. The best evidence of the value of a text-book is gained by a test in the

class-room, but, without such a test, it is our judgment that this would meet, in a high degree, the wants of the average college class.

*Annotations upon Popular Hymns.* By Charles Seymour Robinson, D. D. For Use in Praise-meetings. pp. 581.

These selections and annotations were made by competent hands. Dr. Robinson has commended himself before to the Christian public by his excellent work in editing and compiling spiritual songs. For more than thirty years he has made a study of what will best meet the wants of a Christian congregation in its song service, and generally with taste and rare discrimination. One after another has followed "Songs of the Church" in 1862; "Songs of the Sanctuary," 1865; "Psalms and Hymns," 1875; "Spiritual Songs," 1878; "Laudes Domini," 1884; "New Laudes Domini," 1892; and now this excellent collection with his annotations.

The cherished hymns of all evangelical churches are included, and the sketches of their composers and the circumstances (in many cases) of their composition will give added interest and preciousness to them. All denominations feel from time to time the need of hymn-book enrichment, and ought to welcome a treasury like this from which they may draw. Our General Synod has a committee for this purpose now, and we commend this volume to the committee for their careful examination. It is a fine volume, printed in double columns on good paper and illustrated with pictures of many of the writers.

*Brave Lads and Bonnie Lassies.* By Frederick Myron Colby.

It must be a mentally and physically unhealthy boy who is not stirred by deeds of daring. That a tale is exciting is sufficient inducement to the majority of youthful readers for wanting to read it, else why are the periodicals designed for them so largely composed of stories and illustrations calculated to gratify the desire for what is romantic, thrilling and exciting? While much of this material is unwholesome it is so only because it represents life in a false light and creates in the reader a longing for life impossible. But such is not the case in reading of the brave and daring deeds performed by the "lads and lassies" in real life, and whose names now grace the pages of history—for they have materially helped in making the history of all lands.

The writer does not claim to have recounted, in these pages, all that has been suffered and endured for the sake of country by the boys and girls, because that would have been an impracticable undertaking, but he has chosen many because they have been but little known, and many on account of their great charm. These "Brave Lads and Lassies" were not the property of one land alone, but Egypt, Rome, Denmark, Norway, England, Scotland, Switzerland, Germany, China, France, our own America and other nations shared their glory. Around each hero and heroine of these tales there is the halo of romance, of patient endur-

ance, of brave unselfishness, of courage, and of daring that will kindle enthusiastic admiration in the breast of every patriotic boy or girl; and, while they fancy themselves only being entertained, they will be learning many lessons in history. Nor can they read of such brave acts, requiring, in not a few instances, extreme suffering, without receiving an impulse toward a higher ideal of manhood and womanhood. If we are to have a race of patriots let our youth read such books.

HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN AND CO., BOSTON, MASS.

*Longfellow's Complete Poetical Works.* Cambridge Edition,

The Riverside Edition contains the complete published writings of the poet whose name is dear to the heart of every true, intelligent American. It is considered the most complete and authoritative of all editions and includes eleven volumes. Six of these contain Mr. Longfellow's productions in verse, and those six have been reproduced in this one volume. It contains all the poems of Mr. Longfellow (arranged as nearly as possible in chronological order) his translations in verse and his beautiful "Christus;" in fact it contains the entire text of the six volumes of the Riverside Edition. We were delighted to find—the first time we have ever seen it—in this collection the first verses of the poet ever published. A biographical sketch, finely written and containing the most important points regarding Mr. Longfellow's life and work, with a fair and appreciative estimate of his character and ability by Mr. Horace E. Scudder, introduces the volume. The bibliographical and other notes, which are appended are of great importance and greatly enhance the value of the work. Very many persons will gladly avail themselves of the opportunity to have these poems in one convenient, substantial volume and at very reasonable cost.

LUTHERANS IN ALL LANDS CO., MILWAUKEE, WIS.

*Lutherans in All Lands.* By Rev. J. N. Lenker, A. M., President American Lutheran Immigrant Society, etc. Vols. I. and II. Illustrated. pp. 838.

The lament is not infrequently heard that writers of other communions, and those of no communion, often show ignorance of the Lutheran Church and her works, or fail to give her proper credit. However well-grounded this is, we are inclined to think that not a little of the fault lies at our own door. We have not been active enough in making our faith and history known. Until recently little was done in the line of authorship except in review articles. Valuable as these were, they were not comprehensive enough and they reached too few non-Lutheran readers. But of late years there has been a most gratifying beginning in book-making in the line of doctrine and history,—such as Krauth's "Conservative Reformation," Hay and Jacobs' translation of Schmid's "Dogmatics," Jacobs' "Lutheran Movement in England," Wolf's "Lutherans in America," Roth's "Handbook of Lutheranism," Reimensny-

der's "Manual of Lutheranism," and others—and now Lenker's "Lutherans in All Lands." A wide circulation of this among others as well as Lutherans will be a good thing not only for the publishers but also for our beloved Church, in making her strength and activity and methods better known.

The general plan of the work embraces parochial statistics, the work of the Lutheran Church in education, charity, missions of all kinds, and the spread of religious literature. This plan is followed in treating of the different countries. Very properly about one-fourth of the entire work is given to Germany and more than a hundred pages to the Scandinavian kingdoms. The reader may be disappointed in the amount of space given to the Lutheran Church in the United States but it has its proportionate share, and we take pleasure in stating that future editions will be much fuller.

The compilation of the data given must have been a work of immense correspondence and protracted search. Nearly every page fairly bristles with statistics, the gathering of which took no little care and patience. This tedious work was evidently done with painstaking carefulness.

It is pleasing to note the earnest spirit pervading the whole book. Mr. Lenker was not only careful in his work but thoroughly in love with it. He had a subject dear to his heart, and he entered into it with a devotion that could not fail to issue in a most satisfactory result. He gives us as his motto, "Loyalty to Lutheran Doctrine, Loyalty to Lutheran People, Loyalty to Lutheran Methods of Church Work," and the reader will soon discover that he is faithful to it. But, great as his enthusiasm is, it does not lead him beyond the office of the true historian. He gives *figures*, and at the same time such trustworthy sources of his figures as to assure us that we can rely upon them.

The work deserves a ready sale, and we are gratified to learn that there is a large and growing demand for it. It should be in every Lutheran home, and we trust it will hereafter help to lead non-Lutheran writers to speak of us fairly and intelligently.

Some of the illustrations are excellent. Others we should like to see improved.

AMERICAN BAPTIST PUBLICATION SOCIETY, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

*Bible Handbooks for Young People.* The Pentateuch. By Rev. A. J. Rowland, D. D., Pastor Franklin Square Baptist Church, Baltimore, Md. pp. 96.

The author, in the general introduction, gives a lucid statement of what is meant by the "higher criticism" and what is claimed by its representatives in the case of the Pentateuch and the book of Joshua. He then takes up the books in detail, treating of each one's name and object its composition and authorship, giving an analysis of the book,

and closing with an excellent summary. It is intended especially for young people, and will prove both timely and helpful in these days of biblical discussion.

HARPER AND BROTHERS, NEW YORK.

*The Boy Travellers in Southern Europe.* By Thomas W. Knox.

If the youth of this generation do not grow up to an intelligent manhood and womanhood, surely it is not because the most talented persons of the age are not giving to them the effort of their best powers. Among those who have very materially contributed to their profit has been the author of "The Boy Travellers." This is the fourteenth volume in a series that has recorded the wanderings through various countries of two boys. To begin with, the writer is particularly fortunate in the delineation of these boys. They are natural, bright, observant, companionable boys, and thus enlist the sympathy of youthful readers, who are inspired by them to acquire such information as they obtained in their journeys. The route described in this volume is that which lies along the cost of the Mediterranean. We meet the leading characters of the book in Venice and with much interest follow them as they travel to Milan, thence to Genoa, Rome, Naples, Malta, Bordighera, Monaco, Nice, Barcelona, Alicante, Almeria Malaga, and many points of minor interest, until we finally leave them at Gibraltar. Some idea of the great benefit which may be reaped from this book may be had, when we say that the writer bestows great care upon his description of scenery and local surroundings; that he never fails to describe the architecture of principal buildings in places visited; that he faithfully enumerates and explains the industries, amusements, products, relics, and leading works of Art in the points touched; that all geographical and historical features, and the traditional legends receive a full share of attention; that if any city visited is noted as the home of poet, musician, sculptor, painter or writer, not only is it mentioned but many incidents connected with their lives, as well as many historical facts concerning them, are given; that when the travellers make purchases they are only such as give the reader a correct idea of the manufactures peculiar to the place where the shopping is done; and that, added to all these valuable attractions, the book is written in the form of an attractive story which easily holds the attention of even a poor reader, and that it is enriched with numberless choice illustrations. It must certainly stimulate an interest in the world as it lies without the limits of native land, and it will do this not alone for young readers. The book is handsomely bound as, indeed, it deserves to be, and an excellent map of the countries visited is placed in the beginning of it so that the reader may have no excuse for not reading intelligently.

*On the Road Home.* Poems by Margaret E. Sangster. Illustrated. 12mo. pp. 145.

Of the quality of Mrs. Sangster's poems our readers need no information. Those given in this very neat and handsome volume and printed on card paper have been collected from Harper's *Bazar and Weekly*, *The Congregationalist*, *The Christian Intelligencer*, *Ladies' Home Journal*, *Home-Maker and Sunday-school Times*.

They are classified as follows: I. For six days out of seven. II. Looking upward. III. Thanksgiving. IV. Christmas Songs and V. Easter.

It is an admirable book to give to a friend—or to keep for one's own daily use.

E. J. W.

THE LUTHERAN AUGUSTANA BOOK CONCERN, ROCK ISLAND, ILL.

*Examination Questions for Graduation in the Department of Church History.* Covering A., Kurtz's Church History. B., Bennett's Christian Archæology. Limp cloth. pp. 89.

Dr. Weidner's work is always done well, and the preparation of these questions for the use of his classes in the Chicago (Lutheran) Seminary are models of definiteness and thoroughness. They will be wanted by students of other Seminaries, by those who conduct Synodical Examinations, and by many ministers who want to refresh their knowledge of Church History.

E. J. W.

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE, ST. LOUIS, MO.

*Lehrbuch der Deutschen Sprache* von August Crull, Professor in Concordia College, Fort Wayne, Ind.

*Erstes Uebungsbuch fuer den Unterricht in der Deutschen Sprache.*

The latter is a series of graded exercises in the correct forms and construction of simple German sentences, designed for the use of beginners in the study of German Grammar. The work is done with great care, and is both steadily and surely progressive in character.

The former is a complete German Grammar for native German students. It comprises a four year's course, and is a masterly work. The illustrations of all the principles of grammar are selected from standard German authors. While the author, in the introduction acknowledges his obligations to the Grammars of Koch, Heyse, Willmanns, Bauer-Duden, Buschmann and Lyon, he evinces the hand of a master and the experience of a teacher of the science which he presents. We congratulate him on having indeed rendered "a service of chivalry" to his beloved mother-tongue in its struggle for existence in a strange land.

M.

MISCELLANEOUS.

*Thoughts for the Thoughtful.* Selected and Edited by Adelaide S. Seaverus. New York: Hunt & Eaton.

*The Day Spring from on High.* Arranged by Emma Forbes Cary.  
Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co.

*A Gift of Love.* Chosen and Arranged by Rose Porter. New York:  
Fleming H. Revell Company.

These three books are of so similar a character that what is true of one may be said of all. They all have selections for each day in the year. These have been culled from the writings of the best thinkers known to literature and it is no mean privilege to begin the day with such stimulus to high and noble living as such thoughts give. Each one of these books will minister to the sorrowing, the lonely, the tempted, the doubting, the depressed. The last two have, in addition to the selections mentioned, a passage of Scripture for each day. They are the most choice books of the kind we have seen, and any one who forms the habit of beginning or closing the day with the thought selected for it, found in one of these books, will find great profit from it.

*The Lutheran Almanac and Year Book.* For 1894. By M. Sheeleigh, D. D. Philadelphia: Lutheran Publication Society. Long a model of its kind and growing better every year. It ought to go into every Lutheran home.

~~LB~~ Books received too late for notice in this number:

*The Twelve Minor Prophets.* Orelli. T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh.  
Imported by Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.

*The Revelation and the Record.* Macgregor. T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh.  
Imported by Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.

*What Think Ye of the Gospels?* Halcombe. T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh.  
Imported by Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.

*Hours with the Mystics.* Vaughan. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.

*The Symbolism of Churches.* Durandus. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.

*Student's New Testament Handbook.* Vincent. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.

*Customs and Fashions in Old New England.* Earle. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.

*Luther's Sammtliche Schriften.* Vol. IX. Auslegung des Neuen Testaments, 3. Concordia Publishing House.

*Polly Oliver's Problems.* Houghton, Mifflin & Co.

*No Heroes.* Blanche Willis Howard. Houghton, Mifflin & Co.

*A Harmony of the Gospels.* Broadus. A. C. Armstrong & Son.

*Devotional Services for Public Worship.* D. Lothrop & Co.

*The Christ-Child in Art.* Vandyke. Harper & Brothers, New York.